

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLVI

MARCH, 1948

NO. 1023

Religion in a Rural Life Program

HIS EMINENCE, SAMUEL CARDINAL STRITCH

*Address delivered at the Convention of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference,
Lafayette, La., November 23, 1947.*

IN APPROVING and setting up the Catholic Rural Life Conference, the hierarchy of the United States had in mind that this Conference was, first and above everything else, a work of the apostolate of the Church. We call it Catholic Action, and Pope Pius XI of happy memory once said that Catholic Action is nothing more than the action of the supernatural life of the Church.

We can't differentiate between Catholic Action and the supernatural vitality of Holy Church. It is not the function of the Church to institute any sort of purely social program apart from its divine mandate of teaching the Gospel. If it talks on social things and offers the outline of a beneficent social order, the Church

has in mind the Christian ideal of brotherhood and the teaching, in terms of specific human experiences, of the moral law.

There are those who would have the Church restrict its teaching to the enunciation of religious and moral principles and abstain wholly from indicating the application of these principles to concrete human problems. This indeed would be a departure from the example given us by our Blessed Saviour, Who did not hesitate to show the right application of His doctrine to specific human experiences. If there is one way that religion can aid and abet secularism, it is by refusing to interpret Christian ideals and the moral law in terms of the daily experiences of men. Virtue is

practiced in our daily social and individual experiences.

Catholic Action, therefore, involves the teaching of the Gospel in terms of the problems of the times. Freely it allows liberty to men in social and economic matters wherein Christian truth and the moral law are not involved. It does, however, tell us about justice and charity in our economic and social behavior. It will be seen, then, that the program of the Catholic Rural Life Conference is a religious program and does not merely offer opportunities for the study of farm problems. The apostolate of the Church is directed to the sanctification and the salvation of souls. We are interested in our people on our countryside. They are engaged in agriculture. Our intent is to help them to sanctify and save their souls in the condition and circumstances in which they are placed.

In the story of agriculture in Western civilization, there has been a struggle to try to make the economic fabric correspond to the Christian family ideal. In the feudal system, set up by Roman law, the soil was owned by great lords and worked by slaves. Those colonies, as they were called, were an economic institution which violated human dignity and human rights. Even when the slaves in later times became serfs, the evil did not disappear. Perhaps the greatest failure in Western culture has been the attempt to carry on this country-

side feudalism under new names. Certainly small farms, owned and operated by families, are the Christian ideal. In right conditions the family derives from the farm an adequate income and is able, perhaps better than in any other economic condition, to do its functions. The dignity of man is preserved and ownership of the land confers inescapable responsibility in seeking the public good.

THE FAMILY FARM

It is not, therefore, just the advance of an economic theory which prompts this Conference to labor for the preservation and the development of the family farm. Indeed, in all this, it is seeking to create the environment for the right functioning of the Christian family. With the advance of industrialism and mechanization, we face again the danger of a return to the feudal farm. If great tracts of land are to be worked by individuals or corporations, and the countryside population becomes a mere group of workers without ownership, we shall destroy the most precious advances in Christian civilization.

Rightly, then, your Conference seeks to preserve the family farm in our countryside economy. But you are doing it for a religious purpose, because you believe that a free, right functioning Christian family is a far greater asset to our democracy than large earnings in the hands of a few. Pope Pius XI, in his Encyclical,

Quadragesimo Anno, tells us that the basic economic evil is the uneven distribution of wealth and its concentration in the hands of a few. There is certainly no better way to secure an even and wide distribution of land ownership than by defending and promoting the family farm.

There have come from the studies and experiments of our scholars in agriculture great advances in farm technique. It is possible today to increase the yield of crops by scientific farming. To bring a knowledge of these advances to the operators of family farms is indeed a charity and helps them to earn an adequate family income. If you cooperate, the Departments of Agriculture of our Federal Government and our States can help the people on our countryside to use the new methods of scientific farming. Doing this is justice, because justice demands adequate family income.

There is a danger in our economy which consists in a want of right balance between farm economy and industrial economy. Our whole economic system suffers when this balance is not preserved. If reasonable economic opportunities are not given people on our countryside, there is the danger that it will be deserted. You are working to establish and preserve this balance and to create a right interest in our countryside, so that it will remain productive and populated. But you are doing this because you

know that where justice reigns, Christian life flourishes.

It would be a mistake to interpret, therefore, your program as a mere agricultural program. It is something more than this. You are actually trying to help preserve a countryside condition in which the ideal of the Christian family may be more easily realized. It is proper that in your activities there is religious instruction, and all of us admire what you are doing and have done in this field. We know that our democracy, which rests on Christian truth, will flourish so long as men kneel at the foot of the Cross. There is no solution of our farm problems apart from deep Christian life.

You have studied the agrarian problems of other countries; you know how some countries are so poor in agricultural resources that they must depend on imports for food. You know how the attempt to carry on feudal economy on the countryside has brought great political upheavals. Our country is exceptionally rich in its farm land resources. Today we are feeding ourselves, and we are feeding millions in other lands. There are no farm problems among us which are not soluble. If you carry on your apostolate vigorously and others co-operate with you, you will be a mighty factor in bringing about a great Christian renaissance in our Western world.

Pius XII on Nationalization

LEWIS WATT, S.J.

*Reprinted from The Month**

IT will never be possible for moralists and social economists to write *Finis* to the treatise on private ownership. With changes in the forms of social life and of economic organization, new problems will arise in the sphere of property-relations for the consideration of ethicists no less than of law-makers. Either in the light of some preconceived theory or merely in order to adapt legal provisions to social developments, legislators will make new enactments from time to time to regulate the legal right of ownership, always of course with the professed intention of safeguarding and advancing the welfare of the community. It will be for social philosophers to apply their minds to the complicated task of arriving at a moral judgment both about the legislation and about the social conditions which it claims to meet; if they content themselves with reiterating formulae designed for earlier and dissimilar conditions, they will find themselves marooned on an intellectual island while the current of events, legislation and public opinion flows past them.

There is, of course, not the slightest reason to suppose that there will

be unanimity of moral judgments in the future, any more than there has been in the past. It cannot be expected that the views of Communists and individualists, materialists and Christians, will coincide on many points of social policy. When they do, it will be a coincidence in the strictest sense, since their fundamental principles are so widely divergent. Even among Catholic moralists it has always been recognized that there is room for differences of opinion, though the field of agreement between them is far wider and more important than that of disagreement, and includes, in addition to the truths of Christianity, all the main precepts of the natural law.

In the matter of ownership, every Catholic moralist would maintain, with Leo XIII and Pius XII,¹ that the right to private property is fundamental to every just economic and social order, and that the Christian conscience must condemn as unjust any social order which either explicitly denies the natural right of private ownership of means of production as well as of consumption goods, or in practice prevents the citizens from exercising that right. Not only is it

¹ Broadcast of September 1, 1944, cf. CATHOLIC MIND, October, 1944, pp. 577-586.

* 114 Mount St., London, W. 1, England, September, 1947

a stimulus to effort and enterprise if personal industry is rewarded by private ownership, but in this way there is secured to the citizen that independence which he requires in order to fulfill the moral responsibilities which God imposes upon him personally.

Has Social Aspect

So far the most extreme individualist would find no cause for disagreement; but of course that is not the whole of the Catholic doctrine about property. To avoid misunderstanding, Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno* insisted strongly on the fact that the institution of private property has a social as well as an individual aspect; that its natural purpose in the designs of God is not merely to enable those who, in one way or another, have become property-owners to support themselves and their dependents and to develop their natural capacities, but also to benefit the community as a whole. That is why the State is charged with the duty of ensuring that the property-system does not operate to the detriment of society, and of so adapting it to contemporary social conditions that it gives the maximum of advantages to the citizens as individuals and as a society. This well-established Catholic principle has been more than once reiterated by Pius XII, whose knowledge of social developments throughout the world has been frequently demonstrated in his public pronouncements.

In his world broadcast² at Whitsun, 1941, he said that the system of private property (which of course includes private trading, gifts *inter vivos* and succession) ought to be regulated by public authority with a view to enabling the institution to achieve its natural purpose; and he makes the important point that the economic prosperity of a country cannot be correctly measured unless account is taken of the degree to which wealth is diffused among the citizens. Broadcasting³ at Christmas 1942, he again referred to laws about property.

The laws (of the State) regulating private property may change, and may grant a more or less restricted use of it; but if such provisions are to contribute to social peace they must protect the worker from a condition of economic dependence and servitude irreconcilable with his rights as a person. Whether this servitude is imposed by the might of private capital or by the power of the State makes no difference to its results. Indeed, under the oppression of a State which dominates everything and regulates the whole of public and private life, forcing itself even into the domain of ideas and beliefs and of conscience, this loss of freedom can have even graver consequences, as experience proves.

The allusion to totalitarian systems is unmistakable. Later he said:

The dignity of labor demands not only a just wage, sufficient for the needs of the worker and his family, but also the preservation and improvement of a social order in which all classes can attain

² Cf. CATHOLIC MIND, June 8, 1941, pp. 1-16.

³ Cf. CATHOLIC MIND, January, 1943, pp. 45-60.

to the secure ownership of at least a modest amount of property.

The papal emphasis on the *worker's right to property*, both here and in the social encyclicals, is no doubt chiefly due to the fact that the Church considers the existence of a propertyless proletariat a grievous disorder in modern societies; but it also serves as a reminder that her defense of the right of private ownership does not mean that she stands in the ranks of the "haves" against the "have-nots," any more than her implacable opposition to Communism puts her in the ranks of the Fascists and Nazis.

This was particularly clearly expressed in the broadcast of September 1, 1944, already referred to. After rejecting as incompatible with the Christian conscience any social system which is founded upon the denial of the right of private property, or in practice nullifies it, Pius XII brought under the same condemnation systems which, while nominally recognizing the right, are based upon a totally false idea of what it really is. If, for instance, by "capitalism" is meant a system which concedes to capitalists an unlimited right to do what they like with their property, irrespective of the welfare of the community, then that system is condemned by the Church.

Having said this, the Pope describes in three trenchant paragraphs the main abuses of the modern property system: excessive concentration of

economic goods accompanied by the quasi-impossibility for the worker of acquiring effective property of his own, the gradual elimination of small and medium ownership, the economic and political domination of immense wealth and the resultant development of a multitude of people without secure means of living, without genuine interest in the things of the spirit, no longer aspiring after true freedom ready to hand themselves over to any political party which promises food and tranquillity.

This is not the only occasion on which Pius XII has shown that he is well aware of the dark side of modern industrial civilization. In a world broadcast⁴ at Christmas, 1941, he referred to "the domination of gigantic enterprises and trusts," and to private property as being "in the hands of some an instrument for exploiting human labor." In an address to the Italian Agricultural Confederation (November, 1946), he said:

Only too often it happens that economic life and the employment of capital are no longer ruled by human needs in the order of their natural and real importance. On the contrary, what needs are to be satisfied, and to what extent, is decided in the interests of capital and its profits. In consequence, it is not man's labor for the general welfare that attracts and uses capital, but capital which moves labor about like a pawn in a game of chess. . . . In the divinely willed order of nature, man would be the master of things by his labor; he would not be dominated by them.

⁴ Cf. CATHOLIC MIND, January 8, 1942, pp. 1-20.

The Pope went on to denounce "the cold exploitation for profit" of Italian agriculture by financial capitalism, leading to food shortage and the importation of foodstuffs from abroad at ruinously high prices. The remedy, he maintained, is the organization of the Italian farmers in co-operatives, especially in relation to credit, thus strengthening their position in face of industry and foreign trade, the special interests of the towns. This restoration of equilibrium in the national economy would not be secured by the nationalization of the means of production, which is irrelevant to the problem and would indeed, he argued, still further strengthen the interests of the towns as against those of the country.

INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL WELFARE

It is quite evident that Pius XII is fully awake to economic and social developments, and that nothing could be more mistaken than to think of him as merely repeating, in an unenlightened sort of way, that private property is a natural right. Of course he *does* call it that, in accordance with the tradition of the Church, but he is as well aware as every Catholic moralist that natural rights are often abused. Since social recognition of the right turns private property into a social institution, he wants the in-

stitution, as it exists in any country, to be so adapted to the changing social and economic conditions of that country as to promote individual and social welfare in every sphere of life. Social institutions necessarily partake of the general mutability of human affairs, and, as Pius XI once remarked,⁵ even those we are accustomed to regard as completely fixed and static change substantially, for better or worse, in the course of centuries.

History, he observed, confirms what reason teaches us: that nothing human is immutable. The form of family life, the constitutions of nations, the organization of industry, the methods of production, the system of private property, all undergo changes, though these are not necessarily improvements on the past. We must face this mutability of human institutions with equanimity, went on Pius XI, and prepare for it with enlightened foresight. The Church, immutable in her divine constitution, has to adapt her apostolate to the changing shape of human institutions. The unchanging principles of morality, personal and social, have to be applied to new situations and in new contexts. This was clearly recognized in *Quadragesimo Anno*:

Most helpful therefore and worthy of all praise are the efforts of those who, in a spirit of harmony and with due re-

⁵ The reference is to an address which Pius XI delivered to the Italian Committee of Catholic Action in May, 1926. A short passage from it is quoted in *Quadragesimo Anno* (par. 49), in connection with historical changes in forms of property. The full text was published in the *Osservatore Romano*, May 16-17, 1926, and reproduced in *Periodicos de Re Canonica et Morali*, t. xv. p. 100.

gard for the traditions of the Church, seek to determine the precise nature of these duties (of property-owners), and to define the boundaries imposed by the needs of social life upon the right of ownership itself or upon its exercise.

Pius XII has himself taken the lead in this task. In that striking broadcast of September 1, 1944, which was admirably developed a few months later by an eminent Catholic economist in its application to British conditions,⁶ the Pope warned the world that future social and economic policy could not long succeed in developing the true fruitfulness of social life and the normal productivity of the national economy if it failed "to respect and protect the vital function of private property in its personal and social value." What that means is more fully explained by his earlier statement that, in the designs of God, private property ought to be an element of social order, a stimulus to initiative and industry for the purposes of this life and of the next, an instrument of human freedom and dignity. These are the essentials of any sound property-system, and, as we have seen, they postulate a wide distribution of ownership.

When the actual distribution is such as to be an obstacle to them (and we have already seen what the Pope thinks of distribution of property in modern society), it is for the State, in the interests of the common wel-

fare, to intervene. It should protect and encourage small and medium ownership in agriculture, in the various crafts, in commerce and industry, and cooperative unions should be set up to secure the advantages of large-scale enterprise. The Pope takes into account the fact that sometimes large-scale enterprise may be manifestly more productive than these other forms of organization, and in such cases recommends (as *Quadragesimo Anno* did) that the wage-contract be combined, so far as practicable, with some kind of partnership agreement, a suggestion likely to meet with greater favor in this country today than before the War.

It is at this point in the broadcast that we meet with a brief reference to nationalization. If concentration of wealth is such as to nullify the benefits which the institution of private property should ensure, the State, failing the practicability of less drastic remedies, can proceed to expropriation, paying appropriate compensation. It is clear that the Pope does not mean "expropriation of all private owners," or even "of all owners of capital," because he advocates a better distribution of private property, not its abolition. Expropriation is merely a weapon to be used by the State in the last resort when some great concentration of capital blocks the way to just distribution.

⁶ Mr. Colin Clark, in *The Tablet*, January 6 and 13, 1945. The articles have been published by the Catholic Social Guild under the title *Property and Economic Progress*.

Nationalization of all the means of production would lead to the situation which, as he says, existed in some countries as a war-time measure: the State holding in its hands all means of production and providing for everybody and everything under the lash of severe discipline. This is that State-capitalism which he had denounced in the previous year⁷ as turning the workers into a gigantic labor machine. It is in conflict with the Church's teaching about the limits of the function of the State, summarized (from *Quadragesimo Anno*) by Pius XII in the words: "What individual men can do for themselves and by their own forces should not be taken from them and assigned to the community."⁸

APPROPRIATE COMPENSATION

A further opportunity was afforded to the Pope of giving his views about nationalization when the Italian Workers' Association held a congress in Rome in March, 1945. He received in audience a delegation from it on March 11, and in an address⁹ laid down the Catholic principles which they should follow. Speaking of "What is today called the nationalization or socialization of industry (*azienda*)," he stated the conditions necessary to justify it. It can be accepted by Catholics only in cases

where it is seen to be really necessary for the general welfare; which is to say, when it is the only really effective method of remedying some abuse or of avoiding a wastage of the nation's productive forces, and of ensuring that they are coordinated and directed to the advantage of the national economic interest. The purpose must be the regular and peaceful development of the national economy in order to promote the material prosperity of the entire people, a prosperity such as will be a sound basis of cultural and religious life.

Nationalization imposes in every case the duty to pay appropriate compensation, and by "appropriate" the Pope says he means "what, in the concrete circumstances, is just and equitable to all concerned." Then, alluding to the so-called "democratization of the economy," he commented that "this is threatened not less by monopoly, or by the economic despotism of an anonymous agglomeration of private capital" (i.e. in joint-stock companies) "than by the enormous strength of organized masses quick to employ their power in a way that is unjust and an injury to the rights of others."

On July 10, 1946, Pius XII sent a letter¹⁰ to M. Charles Flory, the President of the *Semaines Sociales de France*, which appears to have caused

⁷ Address to Italian Workers' Delegation, Whit Sunday, 1943. Cf. CATHOLIC MIND, July, 1943, pp. 1-9.

⁸ Address to Cardinals, February 20, 1946. Cf. CATHOLIC MIND, April, 1946, pp. 193-203.

⁹ Cf. CATHOLIC MIND, December, 1947, pp. 707-711.

¹⁰ Cf. CATHOLIC MIND, November, 1946, p. 673.

in France more surprise and discussion than one would have expected, in view of his statement to the Italian Worker's Association just quoted and available to anyone in the official journal of the Holy See, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (1946: p. 315). "The letter has provoked, particularly in France, lively commentaries of differing interpretations. Through these it was easy to see the play of political parties and political speculations which, distorting the Pope's teaching, accused him, *inter alia*, of condemning the nationalization of enterprises outright and as such." So wrote the *Osservatore Romano* in a leading article on September 27, 1946, which proceeded to quote with approval the long explanation of the papal letter by A. de Marco, S. J., in the *Civiltà Cattolica* of September 7, thus giving that explanation a semi-official character.¹¹

The letter is much too long to quote here in its entirety. It deals with the genuine meaning of a "national community," with the dangers of a totalitarian State, with the advantages of "associations or corporative units" from the social and economic standpoint, and with the nationalization of enterprises. On the latter point, Pius XII wrote: "Instead of diminishing the mechanical character of life and work in common, nationalization, even when morally licit, is more likely to increase it."

The *Civiltà Cattolica* article states that "according to the social thought of the Church, and this must be emphasized, the nationalization of enterprises is, in particular instances, not only licit but also opportune, and hence a suitable policy to be put into effect," and it cites the address to the Italian Workers in March, 1945. In other words, it continues, according to the Church, nationalization is one of the means, but neither the only nor the primary means, at the disposal of the State for the purpose of ensuring that productive property fulfills its social function and serves the public welfare. Recourse must be had to it if and in so far as other means, less radical and violent, have been shown by experience to be insufficient in any particular case, to secure the effective subordination of private property to the national interests and to the just distribution of the products of industry.

Nationalization is appropriate in the case of an industry which, by its monopolistic character or by the nature of its product, is an instrument of exploitation in the hands of the private capitalist or in some way imparts to the whole productive system a direction contrary to the general welfare. As possible instances, the article mentions the big banks, transport, armament manufacture, some branches of the chemical industry, and others which, in given circum-

¹¹ So the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* (Louvain), May, 1947.

stances, are of particular national importance or resist the demands of public welfare. On the other hand, the mere fact that the State has the duty of exercising control over the production and distribution of wealth is not sufficient to justify nationalization of an industry, either morally or economically.¹² The State has various other methods of performing its duty, such as fiscal policy, part-ownership of share-capital by the State, control over financial operations (*la disciplina dei finanziamenti*), legislation for the workers to share in profits and management so far as this can be done without prejudice to industrial efficiency.

NOT WITHOUT DISADVANTAGES

Even when nationalization is morally legitimate, the article continues, it is not without its disadvantages. These may be outweighed by considerations of the public interest, but they exist none the less. In large-scale modern industries the worker is a cog in the productive machine, and, we may add, the growing importance of personnel managers is a clear sign that employers are coming to realize the need for countering the depersonalization of the great mass of employees. Nationalization of an industry tends to increase this depersonalization because, no matter how fervently

they are assured that the factory, mine, railway, and so on, where they work belongs to the nation, employes know, or soon discover, that their employer is the State, that abstract and impersonal reality, armed not only with economic power, but with political power, too. They become, to a certain extent, militarized.

When nationalization is not restricted to a few industries but extends to all, or the greater part, of the means of production, we have what the article calls "the supercapitalism of the State," an essential element in a totalitarian policy, since State-domination of the national economic forces is the prerequisite to State-domination of the entire life of its citizens in every department, including those of conscience, religion, education and the law. This is the new absolutism, much more far-reaching than the old, which contented itself with strictly political despotism. In the name of social justice and a more equitable distribution of wealth, the whole people passes from economic bondage under the liberal capitalist regime to the twofold slavery, economic and political, imposed by the supercapitalist State. Under modern conditions this is an ever-present threat to the existence of a democratic regime, and those who believe in democracy should

¹² The State should, in the public interest, "supervise, assist and regulate" private enterprises (*Summi Pontificatus*, 1939); cf. *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), "guide, supervise, stimulate, restrain." According to Newman, the Englishman of 1855 considered the duty of a ruler to be that of "overseeing, facilitating, encouraging, guiding, interposing on emergencies" (*Discussions and Arguments*, p. 336).

realize that in the Catholic Church they have a strong ally in their resistance to totalitarianism, whether of the Right or of the Left.

In view of this authoritative article it would be quite unjustifiable to interpret the papal letter to M. Flory as an outright condemnation of all nationalization of property, even if the letter itself, with its phrase, "even when morally licit," were not clear enough to any careful reader, as it certainly is. The letter is obviously not to the taste of those who maintain that nationalization of an industry can do nothing but good; and still less is it acceptable to those who would like to see the State extend its ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange as fast and as far as possible, i. e. to collectivists.

The latter are not at all likely to be surprised if they know anything at all of the Church's unwavering hostility to Marxist Socialism, a materialist philosophy of which collectivism is the economic side. As long ago as 1848 the Communist Manifesto, drawn up by Marx and Engels, told the world that "the proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State"; and its program included the abolition of property in land and of all right of inheritance, the centralization of credit and of means of

communication and transport in the hands of the State, the extension of State-ownership of factories and instruments of production, the establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

In 1891, the Erfurt Congress, at which the German Marxist party took the name of the Social Democratic Party, demanded the social ownership of land, mines, raw materials, tools, machines and means of transport. This was shortly after the publication of *Rerum Novarum*, with which it is of course incompatible. To what slavery mankind would have condemned itself had it accepted the Marxist program is evident from twentieth-century experience. It was a sound political instinct on the part of the British Labor movement which made it allergic to Marxism.

The Pope has, then, made the Catholic attitude towards the nationalization of enterprises quite clear. Like his predecessors, he firmly rejects the idea that there is something anti-social about the private ownership of any means of production, with the logical corollary that the State should take over the whole, or the greater part, of industry. Such a policy can only smooth the path for Leviathan, the totalitarian State, and the enslavement of its citizens. He would have the ownership of capital more widely spread, by a social policy designed to encourage small and medium enterprises. But he is not blind

to the consequences of industrial and financial development in the last few decades. Great agglomerations of capital resources, often corporately owned, have been formed, the control of which is in the hands of relatively few individuals who exercise enormous power throughout the world.

DANGER TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The most thoroughgoing investigation of this social phenomenon, as it shows itself in the United States of America, is that published by A. A. Berle and G. C. Means in *The Modern Corporation and Private Property* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933). A brief quotation may be permitted:

As the ownership of corporate wealth has become more widely dispersed, ownership of that wealth and control over it have come to lie less and less in the same hands. . . . The concentration of economic power separate from ownership has, in fact, created economic empires, and has delivered these empires into the hands of a new form of absolutism, relegating "owners" to the position of those who supply the means whereby the new princes may exercise their power (Pp. 69, 124).

Needless to say, this development of economic organization, leading to a breach between ownership and control of wealth, is not peculiar to the United States, though in that country it may have been carried further than

elsewhere. But any large concentration of economic wealth constitutes at least a potential danger to the public interest, even when it is not on the gigantic scale which the resources of the United States permit. That the State is not justified in remaining indifferent in face of these problems was part of the message of *Quadragesimo Anno*, which explicitly mentioned nationalization as a morally legitimate method of preventing individuals from exercising power to the injury of the community.

It is this line of thought which Pius XII has continued and developed. If the public interest is threatened by the developments of the property system, the State must intervene to provide a remedy. Should there be no other practicable remedy but to nationalize some industry from which the threat proceeds, it is the duty of the State to expropriate the private capitalists, paying such compensation as is fair to them and to the community in the concrete circumstances. In a word, the State should nationalize only in the last resort, and not regard it as either the ideal or even the normal policy for bringing an industry into harmony with the requirements of public welfare. That it cannot be, for the reasons already mentioned; not the least of which is that the economic system is so interdependent that in the logic of things the nationalization of even

one industry tends to provoke pressure for the nationalization of others, and so to build up the totalitarian State.

Yet it must be stressed that the Pope fully recognizes that nationalization may sometimes be necessary to avert worse things. It is not for him to decide whether the actual circumstances of any particular country are such as to justify the expropriation (with compensation) of private capitalists, or what the precise amount or the form of compensation should be. There may well be room for differences of opinion among Catholics as to whether or not proposals for the

nationalization of this or that industry (including the compensation to be paid) comply with the moral principles set out by the Pope. But all will agree that the organization of a nationalized industry ought to be such as to enable all engaged in it to feel that they are cooperating as intelligent persons and free men, and not as mere servants of the State. It would be fatal to the hopes of a better social order to acquiesce in the idea that the mere fact of nationalization will introduce justice and charity into an industry, or into its relations with other industries and the community at large.



Rural Culture

So much the more, then, must great care be taken to preserve for the nation the essential elements of what might be called genuine rural culture. We must preserve the qualities of industriousness, simple and honest living, respect for authority, especially for parental authority, love of country, and loyalty to traditions which have proved a source of good throughout the centuries. We must preserve readiness to aid one another within the family circle and amongst families, from home to home. All of these qualities we must have, animated with a true religious spirit, for without such a spirit these very virtues tend to degenerate into unbridled greed for profit.—*Pope Pius XII to the delegates at the Convention of the National Confederation of Farm Owner-Operators, Rome, Italy, Nov. 15, 1946.*

The Issue in Europe

*Reprinted from THE CATHOLIC HERALD**

THE first snap of cold weather this week is a sharp reminder of the distress that will be felt throughout the European continent during the coming winter—a distress which, allied as it will be to a steadily deteriorating political and social situation, may decide the fate of Western Europe for many generations.

President Truman's message to Congress does not exaggerate what is at stake during the next few months, and people on this side of the Atlantic should be impressed by the President's determination to effect controls which will enable America to give the vital help needed. It is, nevertheless, imperative that we should remember that the hardest effort must come from the people of Western Europe themselves, for the causes of our present distress go far deeper than any mere material need.

When the democratic Powers after 1918 failed to achieve unity and justice for the world, they made the rise of totalitarianism inevitable. Democracy in 1939 challenged Fascist totalitarianism because democracy conserved a number of moral convictions. But in its failure to apply those spiritual and moral convictions to the world which followed the first victory over Germany, the challenge which it then made led in fact to a struggle, not between democracy and Fascism, but between Communism and Fascism. And Communism won with the aid of the spiritual and material forces of democracy.

Freedom in Europe, therefore, is fighting for its existence against the real victor of the last war.

Tragically, everything that has been done in the name of the democracies since the end of the war has played into the hands of the real victor of that war. Just as after the first war, the democratic victors failed to unite the warring peoples in the name of their cause, but, by confusing the tyrants with their peoples, deepened the original division, so on this occasion the free peoples of Europe have been even more deeply divided and left a prey to the Communist menace by the handing over of half of Europe to Russia and disarming and pauperizing the peoples of Germany and Italy.

The United States has cooperated in this fatal policy, but luckily for the world it has retained through its gigantic material power and its geographical position the chance to stand up to Communism and to help the margin of Christendom on the west of the European Continent.

Now, after more than two years of retreat and weakening, it has become a desperate race between America, Russia and Europe.

And of the three contestants Europe remains the most important.

Why? Because Europe can only be saved if at the eleventh hour and in the face of depression, suffering and political tension it can recover the one factor which failed it after the two wars. That factor is the realization that civilization can only be built by standing for and ruthlessly realizing spiritual values.

CHRISTIAN UNITY

After 1918 Europe failed to reconcile the peoples in the name of a Christian brotherhood and charity and therefore failed to pursue the Christian idealism that lies at the root of democratic idealism. After 1945 Europe not only failed to reconcile itself in the name of Christian love to the people which a few years earlier it had described as the victims of Hitlerism, but deliberately tried to achieve a just peace hand in hand with totalitarianism and anti-Christian Communism.

Today, therefore, nothing can save Europe or the ideal of freedom in the world save the recovery of the people's faith in one another.

By God's mercy, the material help of America is likely to be available, but it will be useless if the peoples of Europe that are still free from the dictatorship of the Kremlin cannot achieve in their darkest hour what they twice failed to achieve in the hour, as they thought, of their triumph, namely unity in hard work for the realization of an order consonant with the ideal of what once was Christendom.

The thought of Germans starving in a wrecked country, of Italians left disarmed in the face of a military dictatorship across the Adriatic, of Frenchmen, the prey of factional divisions, still thinking primarily in terms of nationalistic prestige and civil war, of our own once so prosperous Empire narrowed down to directed labor in a life made mean and colorless—the thought of none of these disasters seems as yet to have caused us all to think again and look for the real explanation of the collapse of the vision of peace, prosperity and plenty. It must do so, if we are to have any chance of re-making a just and free world

which can in course of time beat back by its own spiritual strength the threat of tyrannic barbarism.

The last stage, it may be, of the struggle between freedom and tyranny is now opening with the Communists' plain rejection of the "Popular Front" tactics and their bid in France and Italy for power through violence and social disintegration.

The time is past when anyone who values freedom can further appease Communism or afford quarrels and divisions either between nations or between parties and classes within nations.

When the Pope called, not so long ago, for a veritable crusade, he was not using empty phrases but telling the nations just what is at stake, and just what quality of idealism is necessary if the years of suffering and bloodshed are to bring peace and justice to the world again.



The Church in Free India

"In a free India two great obstacles to the spread of Christianity will disappear: Christianity can no longer be looked upon as a religion supported by a foreign power and conversions to Christianity can no longer be objected to as so many political losses to Hinduism. The adoption of general as opposed to communal electorates also lifts religious interests outside and above the political.

By the very fact also, in a free and democratic India, missionary work will appear in its genuine supra-national character, while Christianity will progress by its intrinsic truth and universal appeal. With the spread of education and of democratic ideas the caste system, even if it survives, will no longer be able to veto conversions in the higher castes by a deterrent socialist ostracism. The new Constitution of India guarantees to all persons freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practice and propagate religion (article 13). Even the Indian States, up to now rather closed to Christianity, will have to come into line with greater India."—**RAYS OF LIGHT, Trichinopoly H.O.S. India, November, 1947.**

A Declaration of Human Rights: A Major Hope of Afflicted Humanity

WILFRID PARSONS, S. J.

Address delivered at the National Convention of the Catholic Association for International Peace, Boston, Mass., April 6, 1947.

ON February 2, 1947, an international Bill of Rights, elaborated by a special committee appointed by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, was published for presentation to the Committee on Human Rights of the United Nations.

This international Bill of Rights was the latest of a series of similar productions by other groups, religious and otherwise, loyally responding to the swelling demand for a Bill of Rights which antedated Dumbarton Oaks and the San Francisco Conference which adopted the Charter of the United Nations. A large part of the world has openly expressed the conviction that if we are to have a real community of peoples, these peoples must be united on a common agreement of what constitutes the legitimate position of the human person in the state in which he lives, and of the state which exists in the world. An international Bill of Rights is the irreducible guarantee of unity, peace and prosperity, law, justice and tranquility.

This demand for such a Bill of

Rights really goes back to the historic meeting of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill in the Atlantic Ocean on August 1, 1941, when the document called the Atlantic Charter was given to the world. On the previous January 6, 1941, President Roosevelt had, in his annual message to Congress, promulgated the now-famous Four Freedoms: "freedom of speech and expression . . . freedom of every person to worship God in his own way . . . freedom from want . . . freedom from fear . . ." In the Atlantic Charter, only freedom from want and fear were mentioned, since that document was a political, rather than a philosophical, one. But in the preamble of the Washington Declaration of January 1, 1942, by which all the nations then at war with Germany, including Russia, and already called the "United Nations," declared their adhesion to the Atlantic Charter, the following significant phrase occurred: "Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and

justice in their own lands as well as in other lands . . ." (Preamble, *Toward the Peace*, U. S. Department of State, Publication 2298, p. 2). This was the first time on the record that "human rights" in the dealings of the United Nations were mentioned by name.

Nearly two years later, when Cordell Hull made his now historic trip to Moscow, one of the declarations that proceeded from that meeting, that on Italy significantly, November 1, 1943, contained these pregnant words: "Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, and of public meeting, shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people." (TTP. p. 7). This was the first time in this series of public statements when a concrete statement of rights was made.

A month later, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill met with Marshal Stalin at Teheran in Persia, on December 1, 1943. The declaration that was published after that conference spoke of those nations "dedicated to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance . . ." (TTP. p. 15). The formula was just vague enough to mean nothing. But, in its generalities, it could include everything. The various international meetings on Food (June 3, 1943), UNRRA (November 9, 1943), Finance at Bretton Woods (July 22, 1944), and Aviation (December 7,

1944), perhaps by the nature of the matters discussed, produced nothing about human rights as such, though they were obviously in the background and in the members' minds. Neither, surprisingly enough, did the Yalta Conference, February 11, 1945, at least in the documents that were released on that meeting.

Meanwhile, however, at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington, the nations were writing the preliminary draft of an international organization. By that time pressure was pretty strong to include a bill of rights in any charter that was adopted. It was explained, however, that the proper place for this was in the Preamble, and the writing of that was put off until the actual convention which would write the Charter. In one place in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, however, Chapter IX, Sect. A, par. 1, dealing with economic and social cooperation, these words occur: "With a view to the creation of stability and well-being . . . the Organization should . . . promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms . . ." (TTP. p. 24). This latter phrase was to have quite a history, as we shall see.

Finally, on June 26, 1945, at San Francisco, the Charter of the United Nations was completed, and it was then seen that the idea of human rights loomed very large in it. Paragraph 2 of the Preamble (whose basic text is said to have been composed by

General Jan Christiaan Smuts) lists as one of the expressed aims of the United Nations, "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." A State Department release at the time termed the reference to the dignity of the human person "a new departure in the history of international organization."

Again, in Article 13, par. 1, we read: "The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of . . . b. promoting international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational and health fields, and assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." The same words occur again in Article 55, c, where there is question of the specialized agencies under the Economic and Social Council, and again in Article 68, which provides for setting up commissions "for the protection of human rights." Finally, in Article 76, we are told that one of the basic objectives of the trusteeship system is ". . . c. to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all

without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, and to encourage recognition of the independence of the peoples of the world."

On June 21, 1946, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights was finally set up, and at its first meeting Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was elected chairman. It has been meeting regularly ever since at Lake Success writing a definitive International Bill of Rights.¹

THE CAMPAIGN FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

All of this copious recognition by the United Nations Charter of "human rights and fundamental freedoms" came about as the result of a long and arduous campaign, conducted mostly by the religious forces of the nation, ably seconded by Latin-American statesmen and a few others. As long ago as April 14, 1941, the Catholic Association for International Peace published in "America's Peace Aims" an international bill of rights, which was widely circulated thereafter.² During 1943 and 1944, several groups had begun the study of a bill of rights and the drive to have human rights recognized formally by the nations was greatly intensified.

On October 7, 1943, the "Pattern for Peace" was issued by a group of Catholics, Protestants and Jews. The

¹ The Commission shifted its deliberations to Geneva in December, 1947. (Editor).

² The previous year, the International Union of Social Studies, with headquarters at Louvain, Belgium, had published its excellent *Code of International Ethics*, which contains most of the fundamental human rights.

second of its seven points was this: "The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization." This was followed up on April 5, 1945, by a manifesto entitled "Goals for San Francisco" from the same group responsible for the writing of the Pattern for Peace. The ninth of its ten points said: "The Charter should contain an international bill of rights and provide a commission or commissions to protect and further the rights and liberties of the individual and of racial, religious and cultural groups, especially those uprooted by war or oppression." The campaign was not entirely successful, because, apart from the several general mentions of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Charter, no bill or list of rights as such was incorporated in that instrument. However, this much was accomplished: a Commission, as I have said, was appointed to draw up a bill of rights, which it is expected will be accepted by the General Assembly and ultimately become a part of the fundamental law of the United Nations.

That, however, was only the first part of the campaign. A much more difficult task was to formulate a list of specific rights that would be ac-

ceptable to most of mankind. Thus, in 1943, the American Law Institute appointed a committee "representing principal cultures of the world" (American, Arabic, British, Canadian, Chinese, French, pre-Nazi German, Italian, Indian, Latin American, Polish, Soviet Russian and Spanish) to draft a bill of rights.

It did so, after eighteen months of work, in eighteen articles, in each of which the right was asserted and then the corresponding duty of the state. When, however, the draft was presented for adoption it was rejected, principally because, we are told, of Article 12: "Everyone has the right to work. The state has a duty to take such measures as may be necessary to insure reasonable wages, hours, and other conditions of work." It was objected that this right could be guaranteed only by taking over "the whole control of economic life." And yet there would be no hope of getting Russia's acceptance unless some mention of economic rights and duties was made.³ The American Bar Association also appointed a special committee, which reported on a bill of rights in the meeting of the House of Delegates in the summer of 1946. This tentative bill was never even published and work on it was abandoned, in view of the "immense difficulties of enforcement in the international sphere."⁴

³ James T. Shotwell, "The Idea of Human Rights," *Survey Graphic*, December, 1946.
⁴ *Id.*, *ibid.*

Meanwhile, at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, which produced the famous Act of Chapultepec, March 3, 1945, the Inter-American Juridical Committee was instructed by resolutions IX and XL to draw up a bill for "the international protection of the rights of man." The Committee of four, including our own past President, Charles G. Fenwick, set to work and produced its "Draft Declaration of the International Rights and Duties of Man" which, with its accompanying report, comprises a volume of sixty-three pages.

Also, nothing daunted by the American failures at the Law Institute and Bar Association, several groups, mostly religious, applied themselves to a formulation of specific rights. Chief among these were the American Jewish Committee, the Federal Council of Churches, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Twentieth Century Association, the American Federation of Labor, and the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. We now have declarations of rights from all of these bodies. They will be compared here later.

The immediate objective in the realm of diplomacy was to persuade the Foreign Ministers of the Big Four, who were preparing the peace

treaties with the ex-belligerent countries, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Finland and Rumania, and of course also Austria and Germany, to include in the treaties a specific declaration of the rights of all inhabitants of those countries. Ultimately it was hoped to have it agreed to declare that the domestic observance of these rights in each country is a matter of international concern.

OBJECTIVE ATTAINED

The first and immediate objective was happily attained at least in the first five treaties made. For instance, in the treaty with Italy the following article appears: "Italy shall take all measures necessary to secure to all persons under Italian jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion and of public meeting." With no changes except that of the names of the respective countries, the identical language occurs in the treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania and Finland.⁵ On March 25, 1947, the press carried the news that Secretary Marshall, during the Moscow conversations, had demanded that the same clauses be inserted in the treaties with Austria and Germany Un-

⁵ Italy: Part I, sect. 1, art. 15; Bulgaria: Part II, sect. 1, art. 2; Hungary, Part II, sect. 1, art. 2; Rumania: Part II, sect. 1, art. 3; Finland: Part II, sect. 1, art. 3. *Treaties of Peace*. Department of State publication 2743, European series 21.

fortunately, the peoples of Poland and Jugoslavia, because they were our allies, are deprived of this protection.

The striking similarity of the human-rights article in these treaties with the language used by the United Nations Charter will not escape notice, and the fact that the human rights clause is an integral part of each treaty gives support to the contention that the other signatory nations may exact execution of it, even though a violation of it would take place within the national boundaries of the offending nation. Each of the treaties, in fact, under the heading of Final Clauses, contains the machinery for settling "any dispute concerning the interpretation or execution of the treaty," and all decisions are to be made by a simple majority, with the veto power excluded.

Thus has come to fruition a long and arduous struggle. The success of the campaign to date is due largely to the religious forces of this country, which exercised constant pressure through public opinion to have human rights officially and explicitly recognized in any international organization. That objective has, as we have seen, been largely attained. What remains to be done is to have the United Nations Commission on Human Rights adopt a declaration of rights that will be (1) acceptable to as many nations as possible; (2) as comprehensive as possible; and (3) capable of being put into execution. And

when that is done, it will require unceasing vigilance on the part of all right-thinking people to expose all violations of rights and demand that these be punished.

WHAT HUMAN RIGHTS?

When it comes to examining the many different lists which have been proposed to the U.N. Commission of Human Rights for their adoption, we find an interesting situation: an almost complete agreement on certain specific rights which may therefore be called fundamental, and a very wide variety of suggestions as to other rights which do not at present, apparently, have universal acceptance. If we take the N.C.W.C. Declaration of Human Rights as the basis of comparison, we can divide all the rights suggested in all the lists into four categories:

1. Rights which are common to the N.C.W.C. list and to all the others;
2. Rights in the N.C.W.C. list, but not in all the others;
3. Rights in the N.C.W.C. list and in none of the others;
4. Rights in the other lists, but not in the N.C.W.C.

1. Rights common to all the lists.

The following rights which all the lists contain are obviously those which enlightened opinion everywhere unanimously agrees are imprescriptible rights. With the exception of three,

as we shall see, they were already contained in the original American Bill of Rights, the first ten amendments to the U. S. Constitution proposed in 1789 and adopted as a whole in 1792, and also for the most part in the French revolutionary *Declaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* of August 26, 1789. They are:

1. Freedom of worship and of conscience.
2. Freedom of opinion and expression of opinion.
3. Freedom from undue search and seizure.
4. Right to petition of grievances.
5. Liberty under the law, including habeas corpus protection of the law, including jury trial.
6. Right of association, including political.
7. Right of free assembly, including political.
8. Right to education.
9. Right to work.
10. Right to social security.

The last three listed here—right to education, right to work, and right to social security—were not thought of by our forefathers. They are distinctly modern in conception. It is significant, however, that all the lists examined contain them in one form or another. They are clearly the result of the thought of a century-and-a-half of democracy and of practical democratic equality which in 1789 had not advanced to that of our day.

Of these three "new" rights, the

right to work is the most misunderstood and therefore the most controversial. On one extreme, the right to work is construed to exclude the closed shop and to be the exclusive prerogative of the workman who will not join a union. On the other extreme, this right is interpreted to involve a complete governmental duty to secure full employment to everybody able and willing to work, even if this involves complete management by government of the whole economic system. The N.C.W.C. formula is simple: "The right to work and to choose one's occupation" (Art. 13). Perhaps, however, in view of the controversy, the most acceptable is that of CSOP: "Every person has the right to receive from the state assistance in the exercise of his right to work; and the state has the duty to promote stability of employment, to insure proper conditions of labor, and to fix minimum standards of just compensation" (Art. 18).

The right to education is clearly a result of the necessities which the democracies have experienced in ensuring that their citizens, who have civic responsibilities and duties, should also have the duty of being educated.

The right to social security is similarly a result of the inequalities and injustices that flow from the modern capitalistic system.

2. *Rights in the N.C.W.C. list, but not common to all.*

Some of these rights thus listed are not immediately evident to human reason, but are suggested to reason by Divine Revelation. Others can be discovered by reason, but the Catholic tradition tends to persuade their acceptance. They are:

1. Right to life and to bodily integrity from the moment of conception. This is certainly a fundamental right, but in its fullness is not accepted by all those who admit certain forms of abortion, sterilization and birth control. CSOP and the Inter-American Commission have this right partly expressed.

2. Right to a religious formation. In essence this is the right to private schools, against governmental monopoly of education. Again, Catholics are the foremost, though not the only, protagonists of this right. The AFL and CSOP partly accept this right.

3. Right of access to a livelihood. Only AJC and the AFL agree in the formulation of this right, though the latter has not always agreed in practice in its second part, "by migration if necessary."

4. Right of private property. This right is omitted by AFL and CSOP, presumably because of the presence of Socialists in their membership.

5. Right to a nationality. This right is accepted by the American Jewish Committee, which develops it rather fully, and by the Inter-American Committee, which adds to it the right to renounce one's nationality.

6. Right to a living wage. This right is implied in CSOP's formulation of the right to work, given above; and also in AFL's rather lengthy statement on the rights to organize and to a higher labor standard.

3. *Rights in the N.C.W.C. list, and not in others.*

In this category are certain rights suggested by Papal Encyclicals and also most of the rights under the heading of family, state and international community. The interest of the N.C.-W.C. list in the Papal Encyclicals is obvious, but the inclusion of a whole list of rights of the family, of the domestic rights of states, and of states in the international community, marks a sharp difference between the N.C.-W.C. list and all the other lists. For the N.C.W.C. list is not only a bill of individual human rights, as are all the others, but also an *international* bill of rights in its truest sense, which the others are not. Only the old CAIP Bill of Rights in *America's Peace Aims* had an international viewpoint. The three rights claimed by the N.C.-W.C. list and not found in the others are:

1. Right to choose a state of life, including the clerical: this is widely denied in those states which are dominated by an anti-clerical or totalitarian spirit.

2. Right of collective bargaining: this right, strangely enough, is not explicitly demanded by the AFL.

3. Right to organize by industries and professions, or, as it has been called, by vocational or occupational groups. It is the right set out at length in Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno*.

Particularly interesting, however, in the N.C.W.C. list are the three lists of what might be called group rights, as distinguished from individual rights. Of the nine listed as family rights, three (Nos. 2, 5, 6) are considered by some others as individual rights and are grouped by them under the heading of social security, or education.

The domestic rights of states naturally include those of lawmaking, judicial process, taxation, eminent domain, education, self-defense, but also include those of compelling respect for minorities, emergency powers, control of alien economic groups. They do not, however, include two which are frequently considered to be rights of states: the right to make a just war, or of defense against unjust outside attack; and the right of revolution, or changing the form of government, by violence if necessary, in case of extreme need.

The thirteen rights of states in the international community are so many fundamental principles of what we call international law. If they were everywhere respected, and if respect for them was guaranteed by the organized international community, the scourge of war would be eliminated

from this world. Several of these rights are "new" in the sense that they suppose the existence of the United Nations or of some organized international community (Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12).

4. Rights in other lists, not explicitly in the N.C.W.C. list.

1. Right to adequate food. The American Law Institute couples this right with that of proper housing.

2. Right against retroactive laws. This right, however, could be said to be implied in N.C.W.C. No. 4, "the right to personal liberty under just law."

3. Right to participation in government. This right is asserted by the American Law Institute, American Jewish Committee and the Inter-American Committee. It is obviously a prerogative of every free people, and as a principle was laid down long ago by St. Thomas Aquinas who, speaking in favor of elective, not hereditary rulers, said that "all should have some share in the government" (*Summa Theologica*, I-II, 105, 1.)

4. Right to reasonable conditions of work. This is an obvious corollary of the right to work, but is developed more fully by more than one of the lists (CSOP, AFL, ALI).

Several of the lists also go more fully into detail in developing the right of liberty and protection under the law (CSOP, ALI).

As we examine this broad picture of

what various groups among us consider to be the rights of man, we can ask ourselves: are all these rights to be considered equally valid, equally unchanging, equally natural? To answer this question, we must call to mind that there is more than one kind of right. It would be a mistake to say that the only right is the natural right, inherent and inalienable, and to conclude that, since some of the rights listed here are not of that kind, they are not rights. It would be an equally disastrous error to say that since some of these rights are obviously "new" and subject to change or suspension, therefore all of them are. Yet both mistakes have been made.

NATURAL RIGHTS

There are certain rights, of course, which are inherent and inalienable, being man's by the natural law. But there are other rights which are hypothetical and derived; they are not original rights of man, but they arise because of certain historical, economic or social conditions. They have one or other inherent right behind them. And there are still other rights which are direct grants of the state, given because they are necessary or useful for the common good. These last, of course, the state can take away when and if the necessity or usefulness of them has disappeared.

Examples of original natural rights are: the right to life (man is a person); right to freedom of worship

(man is a child of God); right of association (man is a social animal). Examples of derived or hypothetical rights: right of private property; right of nationality; right to social security. Examples of state-given rights: rights to certain specific "civil liberties." If these distinctions were always clearly made, there would not be, perhaps, such controversies over rights as sometimes arise.

This confusion over different kinds of rights, however, is not nearly so alarming as another tendency of fairly recent date by which outstanding political scientists and legal philosophers, following the lead of John Dewey and Justice Holmes, deny that the individual possesses any right at all as against the state which the state may not take away. In a recent address, "The Higher Law," Mr. Harold R. McKinnon of the San Francisco Bar lists a dozen or so quotations from American university professors (he could have added a dozen more) who teach a doctrine which he rightly terms "the quintessence of totalitarianism." Summing up his conclusions from these quotations, he says:

This teaching denies three essential elements of democracy and thereby asserts three essential elements of totalitarianism.

It denies that there is a moral law which is inherent in human nature and which is therefore immutable and to which all man-made laws to be valid must conform.

It denies that by virtue of this law

man possesses certain rights which are inherent and inalienable and therefore superior to the authority of the state.

It denies that the purpose of government is to secure these inherent and inalienable rights.

It asserts that because there are no immutable principles of human conduct, there is no ultimate standard of conduct and the lawmaker is responsible to nothing but his own unfettered will.

It asserts that since there are no natural rights, all man's rights come to him from the state, and what the state grants, the state may take away.

It asserts that since man possesses no natural, inherent rights, the purpose of government is not to secure those rights but rather the purpose of man is to serve the state.

For over fifty years now, this doctrine has been standard teaching in most universities and law schools of

the land. This fact no doubt explains the inability of the American Law Institute and the American Bar Association to adopt a Bill of Rights to present to the United Nations. People who do not really believe in human rights cannot be expected in sincerity to adopt a list of them. On the other hand, the story I have narrated in this paper of the long struggle to have these rights recognized and of the success of this campaign in securing explicit mention of them in the United Nations Charter and in the peace treaties is one of the most heartening things that has happened in our time. Hitler and Stalin and our own totalitarians have created the inevitable revulsion, reaction and a happy return to American democratic traditions.



Laws and Labor Peace

"You can legislate the conditions under which management and labor can quarrel.

"You can legislate the conditions under which management and labor can maintain an armed truce.

"You can even legislate the conditions under which management and labor can enjoy a negative sort of peace without fighting at all.

"But you cannot legislate harmony into the hearts of men."—
Clarence Francis, Chairman, Board of Directors of General Foods, at Congress of American Industry, New York City, Dec. 5, 1947.

Ontario's "Separate" Schools

The Editors of the OBLATE WORLD*

A CROSS the Niagara River from Buffalo, at the other end of the famed "Peace Bridge" that links Canada's Province of Ontario to the State of New York, lies the town of Fort Erie, Ontario. In this town there is one Catholic parish, that of St. Michael.

The pastor of Saint Michael's is Father Edward J. Canning. Father Canning is an old hand at establishing Catholic "separate" schools, as they are known in those provinces of Canada that have separate-school laws. At Fort Erie he is now giving a "separate" school to the third parish he has served as pastor in the Toronto Archdiocese.

The "separate" school law of Ontario states that any five Catholic householders, owners or tenants, may call a meeting to establish a "separate" school. The meeting is usually called at the direction of the pastor. Trustees are elected and those elected choose a chairman. Thus is a school board created for the "separate" school.

The new board files a petition with the Ontario Department of Education requesting recognition and the powers to establish a separate school. When this petition has been investi-

gated and approved, the new board becomes a legally established separate school board under the Ontario Department of Education.

In Ontario, school-support taxes are a specified part of the general property tax. Where no separate school exists the whole of this specified tax goes to the public schools. But once a separate school board has been approved, the situation changes.

The law requires that the local tax assessor must interrogate each householder as to whether he is a public school or a separate school supporter. If the separate school is a Catholic school (non-Catholics may establish their own separate schools if they choose, but have not done so to any extent) Catholic householders may direct that their school tax be given to the separate school. On Sundays last summer the Fort Erie people created mob scenes as they lined up at the church doors to sign their tax petitions.

If the father of the family is the householder and is not a Catholic, his taxes cannot go to the separate school even though he desires it and his children attend the Catholic school. Of course, non-Catholics cannot direct their tax money to Catholic schools.

Certain corporations may direct their school support taxes to the separate school provided the majority of stockholders are Catholics and so vote. But public utilities and corporations whose stock is commonly sold on the market, in such way that ownership is frequently changing hands, cannot do so.

It is to be expected that under the Ontario Laws the Ontario Department of Education exercises much more control over Catholic schools than the States do in the United States. The separate school board must list all expenditures for property, improvement, building, equipment, etc., and these expenditures must be approved by the Department of Education. The school's books are regularly audited by government inspectors.

The Department of Education arranges the curriculum for all schools and the pastor of the parish is not empowered to make any changes. The separate school board engages the teachers, but all, including teaching sisters, must register with, and be approved by, the Department of Education.

When the Ontario Catholic householder signs his school taxes over to his parish separate school, what he really does is make those tax funds available for the school—if the school needs them. In most cases, once a Catholic school has been built and in operation for a few years, it does not

need all the funds made available to it. The percentage of available separate school funds used by such schools each year does run as high as 90 per cent in some places but in many others it is as low as 50 per cent. The remaining funds are devoted to the general public school system.

FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

The separate school laws in those Canadian provinces which have them apply only to elementary schools, not to high schools. Catholic high schools in Ontario have to be supported in the same way as they are in the United States—by the diocese, parishes and tuition fees of the students.

The Ontario plan presents something for American Catholics to think about. It certainly removes huge financial burdens from the Catholic population. It allows more Catholic money, through alleviation of elementary school costs, to be devoted to Catholic high school education.

The plan, on the other hand, does subject Catholic elementary schools to a great amount of governmental control. In addition, it brings a sort of lay trusteeism—a great evil in the earlier days of Catholic parish life in the United States—into the Catholic school system. Perhaps many Catholic educators in the United States would fear these two drawbacks greatly.

But the plan does work in Canada. The Canadian Catholics—both lay

and clerical—would not consider swapping their system for the United States' one. In the light of their practical experience, it seems that our fears of such a system are probably greatly exaggerated. Certainly the obligation rests on us to do as much

as we honestly can to remove the great school-costs burden hanging over the pocketbooks of American Catholics. A system similar to the Ontario one offers the possibility of a way out. In many States we could get it if we were really willing to work for it.



Opium of the People!

"In very truth, the Christian religion thought of and provided for all things which are held to be advantageous in a State; so much so indeed that, according to St. Augustine, one cannot see how it could have offered greater help in the matter of living well and happily, had it been instituted for the single object of procuring or increasing those things which contribute to the conveniences or advantages of this mortal life."—*From the Encyclical ARCANUM DIVINAE by Leo XIII.*



Laws of Industrial Relations

"My conception of the meaning of liberty in our industry-labor relations may seem very trite. But to me there can be no liberty without respect for others. There can be no freedom without respect for the public welfare. There are no rights unless those rights are linked with duties and responsibilities."

—*Senator Elbert Thomas, of Utah, to the American Political Science Association, Washington, D. C., Dec. 29, 1947.*

THE EDITORIAL MIND

Declaration of Dependence

OUR American bishops' "Statement on Secularism"¹ is a restatement. It is really nothing new. It is new only in its formation, not information. It is ancient truths restated in the light of today's facts.

It is a declaration of dependence—our dependence on God. The statement's first sentence is: "No man can disregard God and play a man's part in God's world." What is "man's part in God's world"? The Baltimore Catechism ("old stuff" to Catholics) defines it this way; "... to know Him, to love Him and to serve Him. . . ." You "know" a thing by being aware of it; by regarding it, not disregarding it. How can you love or serve anything that is nonexistent? Of course, God exists. But the person in the grip of secularism is, as the bishops say, practically unaware of God's existence.

The bishops' statement is not strange, unique. Even as they were publishing it the week-end of Nov. 16, another bishop—our First Bishop, the Holy Father—was saying the same truths in different words. Greeting Leon R. Thebaud, the new min-

ister to the Holy See from Haiti, His Holiness said:

It is becoming more and more evident that without a sincere preparation of hearts . . . peace treaties will be nothing more than incoherent effort and sterile repetition. It would be illusory to expect such a preparation of hearts . . . without a lively recourse to religion . . . without a return to those moral principles which no one has ever violated with impunity.

Religion is man's link to God. Moral principles come from God. You can't have a "return to religion" and moral principles and still cling to secularism.

Also about the same time in Mexico City, Msgr. Jean Maroun, chief delegate from Lebanon to the general conference of UNESCO (United Nations Social, Educational and Cultural Organization), was telling fellow delegates: "Without the acknowledgment of God, the world's citizens cannot live together as a human family."

Four days earlier Ruth Craven, executive secretary of the National Council of Catholic Women, wrote to Francis Russell of our State Department:

To omit from a bill of rights the Au-

¹ Cf. CATHOLIC MIND, January, 1948, pp. 1-8.

thor of human rights will be the worst plagiarism of all times . . . Human rights are natural and inalienable; therefore they are to be acknowledged from the Creator, rather than proclaimed as a discovery of men.

Last Oct. 21 Bernard Cardinal Griffin warned the British people that "unless Britain restores its belief in and love for God, it will go into decline. . . . The real problem today is that a large majority of this country pays little or no attention to the 'first and greatest Commandment' — that we should love God."

The bishops' "declaration of dependence" also restates truths from another old document—the Declaration of Independence:

All the rights, all the freedoms of man derive originally from that fact that he is a human person, created by God after His own image and likeness. In this sense, man is "endowed by his Creator with certain unalienable rights."

Nor is the bishops' remedy for secularism new. It is the same prescription offered by Christ's priests and bishops down through the ages, from Peter and Paul to Pope Pius XII and the priests on our altars last Sunday. Here it is:

If we are to play a man's part in God's world, we must first get down on our knees and with humble hearts acknowledge God's place in His world.

Well, since we've so long had the diagnosis and the remedy for mankind's underlying malady, why are we in the mess we are in? Why has there been no cure?

Because the cure is up to man. The patient hasn't done his part. He has flouted the doctors' diagnosis, rejected their remedy.

How well shall we co-operate with our "doctors" from here on?

Better, we hope, than we have.—
THE MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, Detroit,
Mich., Nov. 27, 1947.

Billions for Peace

ESTIMATES that it will cost the United States sixteen to twenty billion dollars to provide relief immediately and during the ensuing years to the war-wracked peoples of Western Europe and China are somewhat startling. Such gigantic expenditures entail no little sacrifice and some hardship for Americans. No Midas-touch can produce the gold needed to defray these costs. The dollars must come in taxes and increased prices from the purses of the public. Scarcity of commodities also will cause inconveniences. Yet Christian charity and worldly wisdom compel assent to the program.

Europe and the Orient, debilitated by the ravages of war, are impoverished. Starvation and disease stalk the footsteps of millions. Farming and industries, essential to the recovery of these nations, have been halted or seriously hindered by the devastation of conflict. In many instances these conditions have been aggravated by the unscrupulous stripping of the

countryside and factories of all equipment by the Soviets in their grab for reparations. Destitute and desperate people provide ready prey for infiltration and conquest by Communism. Relief in sufficient amounts is needed quickly to put Europe and the Orient back on their feet and keep these nations from falling under Communist domination. The billions of dollars in foodstuffs, clothes, raw materials and machinery is the cost of waging effective warfare against the enemies of Christian culture and democracy.

The price we must pay is heavy. It is dwarfed by comparison with the astronomical figures of the nation's expenditures in the shooting war against Hitler and Japan. Lend-lease alone cost more than fifty billion dollars. The price in American manhood is incalculable. A program of relief that will insure world peace and security is worth the lesser sacrifices entailed.—*THE EVANGELIST, Albany, N. Y., Nov. 14, 1947.*

For Better Movies

FOR ten years now, Catholics have been taking the Legion of Decency pledge against immoral motion pictures. It is the most drastic instrument the Church in this country has ever invoked to combat a menace to virtue. And it has been only partially successful in stemming the tide of evil against which it was devised.

Theoretically, the plan of which

the pledge is a part is simple and effective. Every Catholic, young and old, solemnly promises to stay away from any motion picture that contains features harmful to his moral well-being; he promises further to stay away altogether from theaters that show objectionable pictures as a matter of policy. The Legion of Decency reviews all the films which the producers offer to the public; it classifies them from the moral standpoint; its listings are made available to every Catholic.

So, the individual Catholic, before going to any picture show, or allowing children under his charge to go, consults the Legion of Decency list to find out its rating. If it is Class A-I, children, as well as adults, may go; if it is A-II, adults may go, but the children may not; if it is B, or C, both adults and children will avoid it. If it is a "double feature," the lower classification will govern: children will not patronize a bill consisting of an A-I and an A-II film, and adults will stay away from a house that has a Class B or Class C picture, even if it is combined with one of Class A-I or A-II. If a particular movie house makes a practice of showing B or C pictures the fact soon becomes known and Catholics, complying with their Legion of Decency pledge, will avoid the place altogether.

That is all there is to keeping the Legion of Decency pledge. The effect is that the Catholic adult is protected

against the evil influences, sly or obvious, which immoral films exert, and that Catholic parents know their children are not being exposed to lessons in depravity. The further effect is that movie producers and exhibitors find that dirty films don't draw patrons, and they turn their efforts to better ones; the producers, instead of depending on vulgarity and suggestiveness to make a film "attractive," take the trouble to put real acting, and high entertainment value, and intelligent plots into their films. Thus the motion picture becomes a wholesome, cultural, brightening influence in society, instead of the sordid, depressing breeder of immorality and crime that it too often is.

Such is the theory and the purpose back of the Legion of Decency, and of its pledge which Catholics are in-

vited to renew annually. The results hoped for haven't been achieved in the ten years the Legion has been operating. Hollywood is still making objectionable films, which are still promoting juvenile delinquency, still arousing a morbid attitude toward crime, and still sowing false and evil standards of morality, reflected in sinful living, broken homes and an ever-mounting divorce rate. Catholics, adult and children, are still patronizing these harmful movies, complicating their own moral problems and adding to the profits of the sowers of evil. If every Catholic would give serious consideration to the pledge he takes, making an honest and conscientious effort to live up to it, the whole movie situation would be cleaned up forthwith.—**THE PITTSBURGH CATHOLIC**, Pittsburgh, Pa., Dec. 11, 1947.



Grace and Free Will

In the discussion of supernatural truths there is always a gap between the final argument or demonstration and the conclusion, and this gap must be filled in by faith . . . One might say that the helping Hand of God is stretched out to aid the favored one over the gap, and it is up to him whether or not he has confidence enough to grasp it. I remember a professor of philosophy telling us in class that faith is a "genuflection of the will"—meaning that unless the will bows down and humbly accepts the help of God, it would never be possible to complete the journey and arrive at the full acceptance of Divine Revelation.—**THE CATHOLIC MIRROR**, Springfield, Mass., October, 1947.

Public Health Insurance in the United States

EDWARD A. MARCINIAK

*Reprinted from THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW**

THIS is an age of medical wonders. The discovery of penicillin and sulfa drugs and the development of modern surgery have lessened tremendously the physical risks of illness and disease. The effective use of public health and sanitation measures in recent years has cut the toll of diphtheria, typhoid and tuberculosis beyond wildest expectations. In 1850 the life expectancy of a baby boy was 40 years. In 1900 it was 46; by 1930 it was 59. Today it is over 65.

The combined efforts of doctor, dentist, research scientist, laboratory technician, nurse, government and hospital have made America one of the healthiest nations in the world. American people now have less reason to fear the Five D's—defect, disability, disease, disorder and deficiency.

But this is not the whole story.¹ There are at present an estimated 25 million Americans who have some

chronic illness or physical impairment. While millions of Americans enjoy good health and have the money to pay for good medical care when it is needed, millions of other Americans are the victims of avoidable hardships because they cannot afford decent medical care. A great many American families are daily faced with the bewildering reality of an illness which they are not prepared to meet financially. As a result, millions of Americans, especially those who belong to the lower-income groups, are trapped in a vicious circle of recurring sickness and diminishing income. It is a well known fact that the more often people (in low-income brackets) are sick, the less money they earn. The less they earn, the more often does sickness strike these people. Good food, adequate shelter and clothing, and periodic medical examinations are among the most potent protections against illness. And it is these things that the

¹ For an uneven but fairly comprehensive picture on the state of the nation's health see *National Health Program*, Hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, U. S. Senate, 79th Congress, Second Session on S. 1606. Hearings are in five parts and total 3086 pages. See especially the testimony of Father Raymond A. McGowan, pp. 1667-88; Father Alphonse Schwitalla, S.J., pp. 1787-1818; and Monsignor John O'Grady, pp. 1819-45. For statistical summary of health facts, see Gerhard Hirschfeld and Carl W. Strow, "Comparative Health Factors Among the States," *American Sociological Review*, February 1946, 11 (1): 42-52.

See also the recently published *Compulsory Health Insurance* by Elizabeth W. Wilson, New York: National Industrial Conference Board, 1947.

poor and less well-to-do families are unable to procure in sufficient quantity and quality.

This article is a study of the economic and social hazards of ill health and accidents and of the ways in which health insurance can lessen these hazards. We shall *observe* the facts about the distribution of medical care in the United States, *judge* the situation in the light of Catholic social principles, and *discuss* a program of *action*. This article is about medical economics and social principles. *It is not a medical treatise.*

THE PROBLEM

The health facts revealed by the U. S. Selective Service System during World War II were not only startling, they were also disheartening. Of the first 14,000,000 young men (all in the prime of life) examined, only 2 million met the army's high medical standards; another six-and-a-half million were found to have various defects, but were accepted for military service (of these one million left the army as medically discharged when defects were discovered or developed after induction); approximately $2\frac{1}{4}$ million were remediable 4-F's (about $1\frac{1}{2}$ million were rehabilitated under the army's medical plan and accepted for military service); $3\frac{1}{2}$ million were found to be hopelessly unfit. On the basis of these facts, a U. S. Senate

Sub-committee on Wartime Health and Education estimated that forty per cent (8 to 9 million) were unfit for military service.² Commenting upon these results the Social Security Board said in November 1945:

While some requisites for military service do not necessarily apply to peacetime pursuits, the majority of the conditions which cause rejection unquestionably handicap these men in civilian life. Experts believe that from a third to a half of the defects and diseases of the men rejected could have been prevented with adequate medical care. A considerable proportion of these defects could be remedied with proper medical care.

The facts also reveal that inadequate medical care is both a cause and effect of low income. Negroes, Mexicans, rural tenant farmers, Southern sharecroppers, and urban slum-dwellers all belong to groups where the quantity and quality of medical care is usually inadequate. People in the bottom income groups face the worst dangers of bad health. Medical studies show that people in low-income groups are sick more frequently and for longer intervals than people in top-income levels. Thus, ill health hits hardest the group least able to bear the financial costs of good medical care. In a poll conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in 1944, thirty-one per cent of the people interviewed said that they had at one time or another put off going to the doctor because of the cost.

² Even making allowances for the very high medical standards set by the Selective Service System and for some minor duplications in rejection, the rejection rate is high enough to warrant serious public concern.

Furthermore, in the boom year of 1929 the Committee on the Costs of Medical care found that American families with annual incomes of less than \$2,000 were receiving insufficient medical aid. Here are the figures:

KIND OF CARE	AMOUNT RECEIVED	ADDITIONAL CARE NEEDED
Hospital	67% of need	33%
Medical	36% of need	64%
Dental	18% of need	82%
Health Examination	9% of need	91%

This same committee reported that about thirty-eight per cent of the U. S. population was receiving inadequate or no medical care. The National Health Survey made in 1935-36 found that about 2 million of the most serious illnesses each year were not given any medical attention. The seven states with the lowest per capita incomes average less than two available hospital beds for every 1,000 people. (The generally accepted standard is 4.5 beds for every 1,000 persons.) In addition, forty per cent of the nation's 3,000 counties, totalling 15,000,000 people, do not have a recognized general hospital.

Studies made of relief clients have indicated that, except for the depression years, illness is the greatest single reason forcing families to seek public assistance or charitable aid. In a special analysis of New York's "Hundred Neediest Cases" in 1944-45, it was found that eighty per cent of the

families were poverty-stricken because of illness or the heavy burden of medical costs. According to the American Association of Small Loan Companies, the greatest single cause of people going into debt is the need of paying a hospital, medical or dental bill. Other studies made in Illinois and California reveal that the greatest single explanation for the redemption of government war bonds during the last year of World War II was the cost of ill health. The economic problem of bad health is also indicated by the fact that prior to World War II there were 39,000 physicians in the U. S. who were earning less than \$2,000 a year.

Dr. Howard Rusk, chairman of the Department of Rehabilitation and Physical Medicine of the New York University College of Medicine, estimated in 1947 that "about 97,000,000 people in the United States need financial help to meet the cost of serious illness. This averages two persons out of three."

The American Medical Association has estimated that on a fee-for-service basis, families with incomes of less than \$3,000 cannot meet the expenses of a serious illness. In 1942 seventy per cent of American families were earning an annual income less than that amount. Even in 1946, a very prosperous year in the history of the United States, half the family spending units earned less than \$2,340 and would have been unable to meet

such a crisis satisfactorily. Even making allowance for the fact that some of these "family units" have one, two or three members, the figures reflect an appalling inability on the part of many people to pay the price of good health care.

Other studies have shown that families with incomes over \$10,000 average twice as many calls per person each year as those in families with average annual incomes less than \$1,200. These and other studies show that the physical *need* for medical care has always been greater than the *effective demand* for it. A man may need medical attention but can only effectively demand such care when he can afford it.

PAYING MEDICAL BILLS

The costs of medical care in the United States are being paid for by four systems: 1) the pay-as-you-go plan, 2) voluntary health insurance, 3) public health insurance, 4) state medicine.

Pay-as-you-go. Most Americans now pay their medical and hospital bills on a fee-for-service basis. When illness or accident occurs, the medical costs, if the money is available, are paid for on the spot. Here the medical payment is made directly by the patient to the doctor or to some clinic organized and operated jointly by a group of physicians. This has been a traditional method of meeting medical

bills, and the one with which Americans are most familiar.

Voluntary health insurance. This method of payment operates on the principle of insurance. Payment is made in advance into a fund which is then used to pay the costs of medical care. Health insurance, like fire insurance, takes advantage of the law of averages so as to spread the risks. Under fire insurance all pay premiums, but only the one who has the fire benefits directly from the insurance. Under a voluntary health insurance plan, the sick and well pay into an insurance fund, and the sick benefit directly. Voluntary insurance pools the risks and spreads the costs.

In the United States about twenty-five per cent of its 140 million people are covered by one of the various forms of voluntary health insurance. Less than four per cent are completely covered by medical care insurance, i.e., hospital and doctor's service in home, hospital and office. (Ordinarily this "complete" care does not include the expenses of drug supplies, dental care, home nursing, and expensive specialized care.)

Voluntary insurance plans are of many kinds. Blue Cross plans, for small monthly payments, provide hospital care and certain other benefits. These plans, sponsored by the American Hospital Association, cover about 27 million people.³ For yearly fees, which average about \$15 a year for an individual and \$40 for a family,

³The great proportion of those covered is urban.

Blue Cross subscribers can obtain up to thirty days of semi-private hospital care in any member hospital, the use of an operating room, and certain other benefits (including a fifty per cent discount on hospital care lasting more than thirty days).

Industrial plans are financed through payroll deductions, joint labor-management contributions, or by management alone, and provide medical care and/or hospital services for employees of a particular industry.⁴ Similar plans are also sponsored by labor unions, e.g., the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Commercial medical insurance plans which are promoted by state medical societies provide a variety of medical services but very frequently exclude important medical care like maternity benefits and certain surgical care.

In addition to these there are cooperative medical and hospital groups, like the Group Health Association of Washington, D. C., which for a monthly premium (\$2.50 for an adult, \$10.25 for a family of five) provides wide medical care; plans op-

erated with special group clinics, such as the Ross-Loos Clinic in Southern California which furnishes medical service for a prepaid monthly fee; and medical care plans sponsored by the Farm Security Administration.

There were seven cooperative hospitals and forty cooperative health associations in the United States in June 1947. One of the newer, non-profit health insurance plans is the Health Insurance Plan for Greater New York. For a family cost of about \$40 a year it provides:

1. General medical, specialist, surgical and maternity care at the home, doctor's office, group center, or the hospital.
2. Diagnostic and laboratory services.
3. Physical therapy, X-ray, and other special treatments.
4. Periodic health examinations, and immunizations.
5. Eye examinations.
6. Visiting nursing service at home, psychiatric advice, and ambulance service from home to hospital.

There are no waiting periods or age limitations. For a slight charge ma-

⁴ Henry Kaiser's famous medical care program on the Pacific Coast is a good example of an industrial plan. It protects 25,000 workers, most of whom are employees in various Kaiser industries. In the San Francisco area, each worker pays \$2.60 a month for himself, \$1.85 for his wife, and 80 cents for his children, regardless of number. Thus a whole family is insured for \$5.25 a month.

For this monthly premium, the worker may receive: a) Up to 111 days of hospital care for illness or accident incurred while a member; b) All medical and nursing services, drugs, X-rays, and laboratory tests; c) Full medical treatment at home or in doctor's office, but with a \$2.00 charge for the doctor's first visit in any illness.

The wife and children are entitled to: a) 30 days hospital care for each sickness; b) Medical care at \$1 a visit to doctor's office and \$2.00 for house calls; c) While in hospital, free drugs and medicine and X-ray and physical therapy treatments at half-price.

The doctors are employed on a salary basis. Under the original plan, the policy making was done by the Kaiser Company, but under new proposals the unions would have full partnership in administration and policy.

ternity benefits may be immediately secured. It is a group plan with employees becoming eligible if seventy-five per cent join and the employer is willing to match the premiums paid by the employees. All residents of Greater New York earning under \$5,000 a year, their wives and children under 18, are eligible. Members may select a family doctor from a group of participating doctors in their area. Under such a plan, plus payment to a Blue Cross plan, a worker can get complete medical and hospital coverage for less than \$100 a year (about \$125 a year if the employer's financial contribution to the Health Insurance Plan is included).^{4a}

Public health insurance. This method of payment also operates on the insurance principle. Under this arrangement medical and hospital expenses would be paid from a government created insurance fund supported by employer-employee contributions through pay-roll deductions. Under the public health insurance program discussed in this article, patients and doctors would choose each other. The doctor would provide services as he always has; patients would select hospitals and hospitals would accept patients as they now do under group hospitalization plans, the major difference being that the expenses under a public insurance pro-

gram are paid out of a public fund into which all wage earners within a certain income group would be required to contribute.

Such a form of public health insurance is not foreign to the United States. Back in 1798 the United States pioneered in this field with a hospital care program for merchant seamen that was financed by pay-roll deductions and administered by the U. S. Public Health Service. This health insurance program was operated until 1870 when the hospital program was financed out of general tax funds as a federal program.

Health insurance is not "relief," "charity," or public assistance. It gives people an opportunity to get medical care as their right because they have been making payments for such service. "Once they learn what health insurance means, normal people much prefer it to public assistance, to public clinics, to needs tests, to the embarrassment of asking for credit or outright charity or to any of the other devices which have become traditional because the cost of health was beyond the means of the average man."⁵

Forty-seven states now have partial systems of compulsory health insurance as applied to occupational accidents and diseases. Workmen's compensation legislation, authorizing insurance protection for employes, provides better medical care for the

^{4a} See Neva R. Deardorff, "The Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York Begins Service," *Social Service Review*, 21:157-70, June 1947.

⁵ William J. Gibbons, S.J., "Health Insurance," *America*, June 8, 1946, 75 (10): 192-3.

victims of industrial accidents and better compensation for hospital and physician. A broad plan of public health insurance is all-inclusive because it would protect employes and their families against the expenses of non-occupational accidents and ailments.

Thirty-two countries, including England, Ireland, Brazil, France and Spain, operate national systems of compulsory health insurance.

An indirect approach to the problem of health costs is to be found in Rhode Island. Since 1942 Rhode Island has had a state-operated "disability insurance" program. Operating on a basis similar to unemployment compensation, cash benefits are paid to employes who are ill. The plan covers the State's 350,000 workers who earn more than \$100 a year. Cash benefits from \$6.75 to \$18 a week—depending upon earnings—are paid for a maximum of twenty weeks a year. While primarily designed to compensate a worker for the wages lost while sick, it indirectly helps pay medical bills by maintaining the workers' income during a period of illness. To put the plan into operation no pay-roll deductions were necessary. A portion of the $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent paid for unemployment insurance by employes on their earnings up to \$3,000 was allocated to disability insurance.

State medicine. Where the government hires the doctors, builds and staffs the hospitals, etc., state medicine

exists. In the United States it is a common practice. Examples of state medicine can be found in the army and navy medical corps, in the U. S. Public Health Service, in the Veteran's Administration, in municipal, county and state hospitals, in mental institutions, in public clinics, etc.

Socialized medicine. This is a system whereby all of the nation's medical and hospital services and medical associations are operated by the government, displacing all private and group medical services. All doctors and dentists, hospital staffs, would be on the government pay roll. Only Soviet Russia operates under a system of socialized medicine. It is, actually, a government monopoly of medicine.

Socialized medicine, then, should not be confused with public health insurance which supposes that private medical practitioners and the private hospitals will dispense the services. Under socialized medicine the fee system would be abolished. Under a health insurance system, the fee system remains, and doctors and hospitals are reimbursed for their services from group or public insurance funds.

People should not confuse the issues by labeling public health insurance as socialized medicine. Public health insurance is not socialized medicine: it is a method of paying medicine and hospital costs in advance. One can be in favor of public health insurance and at the same time be vigorously

opposed to socialized medicine. Those persons who label health insurance as communistic are not only misrepresenting the facts but are actually playing into the hands of the Communists. For the Communists are being given credit for a social program which has been operating successfully in many countries all over the world and which has been supported by Catholics in Europe and the United States. Men may honestly be against public health insurance for the United States, but it is dishonest to describe a privately operated health system supported by public insurance as "socialized medicine."

CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING

This is the place to discuss Catholic social teachings as applied to health, insurance, group action and governmental intervention.

Good health is not an indispensable good for the Christian. But bad health may, under some circumstances, become an obstacle to reaching Heaven and seeing God face-to-face. It is obvious that sickness can be a blessing—both to the sick and to those whose privilege it is to serve the sick in the name of Christ. Even when sickness results from inadequate income in an economic system which distributes wealth and income unjustly, such illness can and should be turned to spiritual and supernatural good. For the Church encourages Christians to unite their sufferings

and hardships with Christ's supreme offering at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Saying all this, however, cannot reasonably be construed as an argument against changing the economic system and distributing justly the wealth. Part of this wealth is medical care.

The Catholic Church has never regarded it virtuous to keep people sick. Indeed, the Church, arguing from both reason and Faith, has never regarded it virtuous for people to keep themselves sick. Good health has been regarded as an important part of a good life, to be guarded with reasonable caution, and to be prayed for, as the Church does repeatedly in her Liturgy, as the foundation of a supernatural life and as a normal means for making the service of God and of men more complete and self-sacrificing.

The Catholic Church's attitude toward the sick is best indicated by her practice. For almost two thousand years, the Church has founded and encouraged hospitals, institutions and charitable agencies to aid the sick, infirm, lame and blind. Religious communities dedicate their lives to serve the sick in the name of Christ. In the Catholic's eyes comforting the afflicted and visiting the sick are works of mercy—God-sent opportunities to love the children of God.

The dignity of man as a child of God is the source of the Church's anxiety for his well-being and a key

point of Catholic social teaching. Man is not just an animal with a physical nature. Because of his soul man has been created to God's image and likeness. In addition, man has been redeemed by Jesus Christ, adopted as a child of God, and called to membership in Christ's Mystical Body.

But it is a mistake to believe that man's natural and supernatural dignity relieves him of a normal concern for his physical welfare. This double dignity only makes more important man's right and duty in this regard: *the right* to be secure against those dangers to good health which result from society's failure to solve its economic and social problems; *the duty* to take care of himself and those dependent upon him. Each man is expected to do his utmost to satisfy his personal needs. A good government and a decent community will encourage him to provide protection for his own health and his family's.

With a little care and common sense, with a few essential facts about good health, with an adequate income and a thrifty budget, a man is usually able to face without fear the risks of illness and accident—under the providence of God. But where men do not enjoy the blessings of a decent income, the spectre of ill-health casts a shadow over a man and his family. For a serious illness or accident may jeopardize his security and mortgage his future with debt.

One strong moral inducement for men to assume personal responsibility for their physical welfare is a fully adequate family wage. Pope Pius XI said that

Social justice cannot be said to have been satisfied as long as workingmen are denied a wage which will enable them to secure proper sustenance for themselves and their families; as long as they are denied the opportunity of acquiring a modest fortune and forestalling the plague of universal pauperism; as long as they cannot make suitable provision through public or private insurance for old age, for periods of illness and unemployment.

The first line of defense, then, against the *economic* risks of sickness is sufficient property and a living, savings wage for all adult workers. This is the best way to meet the bills of a doctor, hospital, nurse and pharmacist. But if men don't own property (their land, their home, their place of employment), if men do not earn a decent wage, they cannot meet these bills. Families with incomes less than \$2,000 a year are certainly not prepared, financially, to meet the hazard of serious illness and in many cases to obtain ordinary medical treatment.

Any step taken to raise the real income of American workers is a step towards providing better health opportunities. The American bishops in 1939 asked that

Workingmen should be made secure against unemployment, sickness, accident, old age, and death. The first line of defense against these hazards should be the

possession of sufficient private property to provide reasonable security. Industry therefore should provide not merely a living wage for the moment but also a saving wage for the future against sickness, old age, death and unemployment. Individual industries alone, however, cannot in each single case achieve this objective without invoking the principle of social insurance.

Labor unions, the annual wage, minimum-wage laws, rural cooperatives, profit sharing, group insurance, etc., are some of the many ways of lifting the poor man's real income. And any boost in real income ordinarily means better health protection.

To be realistic, it must be admitted that it will be many years before every family in the United States will have an income large enough to provide for the necessities and ordinary comforts of civilized living. What then is to be done about the financial risks of good health? What have men been doing during the last decade about this problem? How can they aid their fellowmen economically in problems of sickness and accident?

MUTUAL-HELP ORGANIZATIONS

Many Americans have banded together in Blue Cross hospital plans, have formed cooperative medical centers, shared in industrial and union sponsored health programs, or have taken out medical insurance. By these plans they have attempted to balance the cost of illness with the size of their pay check. By this cooperation

men have recognized their right and duty to work together for mutual aid.

Such personal and social responsibility should receive the encouragement and endorsement of all those who profess a belief in the dignity of the human person. To form such mutual-help organizations is as natural for man as it is for the bird to fly. The Bible (*Eccles.* IV, 9) says that "It is better that two should be together than one, for they have the advantage of their society." By co-operating with each other men are able to provide goods and services which they could not furnish alone. Every effort should be made, including the assistance of the government, to promote and develop such cooperative, joint organizations for better health. As medicine is designed to heal sick men, so joint economic activities, like health insurance, are designed to heal a sick society. The task of Christians in this matter was made clear by Pius XII:

Do not let die in your midst and fade away the insistent call of the social encyclicals, that voice which indicated to the faithful in the supernatural regeneration of mankind to cooperate in the arrangement of society and especially of economic life, exhorting to action those who share in this life, no less than the state itself. Is not this the sacred duty for every Christian?

What is the government's job in providing for man's temporal needs? Has it no part to play in the papal plan for social reconstruction? Spe-

cifically, is people's health a matter for governmental action? How do we distinguish the part to be played by the individual, the group and the government? Do all three have equal responsibilities? Or is there some principle of subsidiarity which should be applied?

To these questions Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI have given unequivocal answers. Leo XIII said in his famous encyclical "On the Condition of Labor":

When there is a question of protecting the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have a claim to special consideration—those who are badly off have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly rely upon the assistance of the state.... And it is for this reason that wage earners, who are, undoubtedly, among the weak and needy, should be especially cared for, and protected by the state.

Pope Pius XI has said:

It is the duty of rulers to protect the community and its various elements, and in protecting the rights of individuals they must have special regard for the infirm and needy.

These principles provide the key to an understanding of the papal teaching on the function of government. Governmental action is justified when individuals and voluntary organizations (labor unions, group health associations, cooperatives) fail to do the job. The intervention of the state, then, depends upon the ability of individuals and smaller

groups to provide these necessary goods and services. If they cannot, and the public good suffers, the government not only may intervene, it must step in to protect the common good. Pope Leo XIII's words are a classic statement of the respective roles of individuals, voluntary organizations and government in social and economic life:

Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers, or is threatened with, evils which can in no other way be met, the public authority must step in to meet them.

These principles for the guidance of governments reject a political philosophy which says: "That government governs best which governs least." Instead the Christian principle states: that government governs best which rules for the common good and protects the interests of needy groups—especially the poor, sick and helpless.

Furthermore, this principle provides that governmental actions should be a supplement to existing individual and group efforts to meet a social problem. "It is the duty of public authority," says Pope Pius XI, "to supply for the insufficient forces of individual effort." When the government finds itself morally obliged to provide aid for the ill and injured, it must not destroy or take over the good work now being accomplished by private hospitals, cooperative medical plans, industrial hospitalization

systems, religious communities, etc. If the government is really the servant of the people, it will serve and supplement, not dominate or supplant individual and group effort. "The government," Pope Leo XIII said, "must not absorb the individual or the family; both should be allowed free and untrammeled action so far as is consistent with the common good and the interest of others." It will encourage and promote voluntary organizations; and it will provide direct service where individuals and associations are inadequate for the task. During the days of the Great Depression of the 1930's, the relief agencies did not supplant private, charitable aid, but rather supplemented it.

In upholding this principle of legislation, the Christian is a champion of both freedom and security. *Freedom* for individuals and groups to provide for their own needs—if they are able to do so. *Security* for individuals and groups who, unable to help themselves, are helped by the government. Pope Pius XI has said workers should be freed "from the insecurity which is the lot of the proletariat."

Pope Pius XI has made it clear that where necessary the government

has a perfect right to set up an insurance system to aid the sick and needy. "Social justice," Pius XI said, "cannot be said to have been satisfied so long as workingmen are denied a salary that will enable them to secure proper sustenance for themselves and their families . . . as long as they cannot make suitable provision through public or private insurance for old age, for periods of illness, and for unemployment."

APPROVES IN PRINCIPLE

In quoting Pope Pius XI it is not the author's intention to say that the Pope is advocating a public health insurance program for the United States. It is, however, the author's intention to explain that Christian social teaching approves of public and private health insurance in principle where conditions outlined above are fulfilled.^{6a} Whether public health insurance should be adopted in the United States is a matter of practical judgment that depends upon local conditions. On this point Catholics may come to different conclusions. For involved in this judgment is an estimate of the present adequacy and the future ability of voluntary or-

^{6a} European Catholics have taken a similar position. Father Lewis Watt, S.J., says: "That under appropriate circumstances there should be 'social' (i.e., compulsory) insurance has been steadily maintained by the Catholic Social Movement on the Continent. To say nothing of the support given social insurance last century in Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg, the representative and the influential Catholic organization, L'Action Populaire, gave strong support to the introduction of social insurance [including sickness insurance] into France in 1930, and the Bishop of Autun wrote: 'Certain newspapers urge organized resistance to the application of the law on social insurance. The clergy and Catholics must not take part in this maneuver against a law which, in spite of inevitable imperfections, realizes one of the wishes of Leo XIII in his encyclical *Rerum Novarum!*'"—Lewis Watt, S.J., *A Catholic View of the Beveridge Plan*. Oxford: Catholic Social Guild, 1943. Pp. 17-18.

ganizations to handle the United States' health problem. However, those individuals, and especially Catholics, who oppose a national health insurance program for the United States should make it clear that they are not denying the government the right to legislate on health insurance. Furthermore, the fact that some particular health program^{6b} which is proposed may have real or imagined weaknesses does not deprive the government of its right to intervene in such matters. Christian social teaching not only gives the state the *right* to enact a national health insurance law but also imposes a *duty*, under certain conditions, to set up a universal health insurance program.

What are these conditions? Following Pope Leo XIII's guiding principle for state intervention, it may be said that public health insurance becomes a necessity

1. When there is a real need among the nation's families for good medical care.
2. When the common good or the physical welfare of these people is jeopardized by lack of medical care.
3. When existing agencies and organizations are unable to cope with the problem.
4. When government action is the only way of protecting these families against the risks of sickness and providing for the common good.

^{6b} See, for example, the discussion which has centered around the health insurance legislation introduced by Senators Robert Wagner and James Murray and Congressman John Dingell.

Some attempts have been made by Catholic sociologists to apply these principles to the concrete conditions in the United States. The late Monsignor John Augustine Ryan said in 1943:

The millions of our citizens who are suffering from unnecessary sickness or from insufficient medical attention, can obtain adequate care only through a system of public health insurance. But the system should allow full freedom for group health projects and cooperative hospitalization. When organized groups can guarantee to their members at least as large benefits as those offered by the public system, they should be authorized to operate autonomously. This arrangement would exemplify that fundamental principle of democracy which dictates that the state should never do anything for the citizens which they can do as well for themselves.

Back in 1919 the "Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction" recommended that

Until the level of legal minimum wage is reached, the worker stands in need of the device of insurance. The state should make comprehensive provision for insurance against illness, invalidity, unemployment, and old age.

Commenting upon this statement of the Bishops, Edward Cardinal Mooney of Detroit (then Archbishop Edward Mooney, chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference) said in 1939:

The social insurance provided in the Social Security Act is by no means per-

fect. To say nothing of other defects, it fails to provide for workers' insurance against sickness.

In 1945 Bishop Francis J. Haas of Grand Rapids, Michigan, speaking in Chicago at a Labor Day Mass in Holy Name Cathedral, said:

Now and without delay, Congress should . . . broaden the Social Security Act to include health insurance.

On the same day, speaking in his own Cathedral, Bishop Michael Ready of Columbus said that one of the

Social objectives worth working for in our national economy is comprehensive social security—giving protections against unemployment, disability, old age, sickness, and dependence. Such social security should be provided by contributions from employers, employees, self-employed, and government in fair proportions.

In 1946, testifying before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Monsignor John O'Grady, executive-secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, said:

It is generally recognized that in spite of the great advances that have been made by organized voluntary efforts and by local welfare agencies in providing medical and hospital care for the American people, we still have a large number of people who are not adequately protected. Our problem is to extend coverage without interfering with the gains that have been made as well as with the further gains that are bound to be made in the future by voluntary efforts of all

kinds. . . . It is clear as daylight to me that they cannot do it all, that you need a governmental system, and a large area will have to be covered by government. But government ought to work with the existing facilities. My feeling is that we ought to have a universal prepayment plan.

The purpose of citing these opinions is not to give public health insurance in the United States "Catholic approval" or "Catholic disapproval." These statements are quoted, because these Catholic sociologists have attempted to apply Christian social principles to the problem of the advisability of a public health insurance program in the United States. The world is greatly in need of men who will bring "Christianity into the market place." It is not enough to theorize; it is also important to apply principles.

A SOUND PROGRAM

This paper would be incomplete if it did not try to describe the characteristics of a good health insurance program. The moral principles applicable to health insurance and to the role of government have already been stated. Keeping these principles in mind and the desirability of respecting the rights of the doctor and his patient, we shall attempt to outline some basic technical principles for a sound program of public and private health insurance.⁶

1. Under any health insurance program all the parties concerned should

⁶For several ideas in this section I am indebted to Michael M. Davis, "You Can Get It If You Go For It," *Survey Graphic*, September 1946, 35 (9): 317-18.

be told, in the simplest, non-technical language possible, that the freedom of the doctor, patient and hospital will be preserved. The public should realize that no person will have to take castor oil—if he does not want to take it; that he will not be compelled to go to a certain doctor—or else; that he has the freedom to change doctors and to select any doctor from a panel; that no doctor has to participate under the plan and that he can reject patients that come to him.

2. Health insurance should not organize or direct the service of the physician, dentist, surgeon, or hospital, but only the methods by which the people pay for such service. The professions should be responsible for all strictly medical activities.

3. There should be national standards of administration and distribution, but the administration of the program should be decentralized. The maximum amount of responsibility should reside locally. The big advantage of decentralization is freedom. It is easier for doctors, hospitals and patients to have their complaints and importance recognized on a local basis.

The local housing authorities under the Federal Housing Agency are good models of a national program with local administration. The authorities are sponsored and partially financed by the federal government but are administered and operated by a board of local citizens.

The local boards directing the insurance program would include representatives from professional groups, hospitals, consumers, labor unions and industry. Administrative policies would thus be determined by those who receive and furnish the service. These local committees would, of course, have to recognize the traditions and practices of the medical and hospital professions.

4. Voluntary organizations which provide hospital and medical services should not only be protected but should also be encouraged under a national health plan. If this principle were written into health insurance legislation, it would prevent people from using health insurance as a wedge to abolish non-profit organizations and to create a federal monopoly of medicine. The protection of voluntary organizations would encourage every man to provide the best possible medical aid for himself and his family.

5. As a matter of practical strategy, to win public support and to allay the suspicions of physicians and hospitals, the advocates of health insurance should point out that they are not interested in "socialized medicine" but believe that a combined program of public and private health insurance is the best guarantee of medical freedom.

6. Payment into health insurance funds must be compulsory and cover as many groups as possible. The compulsion applies to the payment, not

to the medical service. Contributions should be compulsory and widespread:

- a) to prevent large families from being burdened with unbearably high medical and hospital costs.
- b) to even up the risks of dangerous employments with those not so dangerous.
- c) to aid the poorer sections of the population whose medical buying power is very low.

The principle of compulsory payment recognizes that risks are many: death, accidents, sickness, unemployment, old age. One man may have to face all of them. Another may avoid all of them until he dies. Universal coverage, invoking the principle upon which insurance is based, spreads the risks.

Father William Gibbons, S.J., explains why this compulsory feature is necessary:

Even though paid a wage sufficient to cover necessary insurance costs on a voluntary basis, many of the lower income workers will not take advantage of the opportunity, through greed, ignorance and inertia. In this case they end up by becoming charges of the state and community, with no insurance provisions. Tax money and extensive charity are the only sources.

In this connection it should be recalled that usually the lowest paid workers are the ones with the greatest risks and therefore in the voluntary scheme would have to pay the highest rates. This difficulty can be got around only by the government.⁷

Testifying before the U. S. Senate Committee on Education and Labor on May 7, 1946, Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, stated:

From the very beginning, a national health security program must have universal coverage. That is, a program that does not have universal coverage is not going to meet our needs.

This does not mean that everybody will be included in one governmental system. It does mean, however, that everybody must be covered. *Coverage must be compulsory in fact, but voluntary in form.* And what does this mean? It means that all those who now are covered by voluntary programs can continue in their present status. It means an opportunity and an incentive to provide new voluntary programs.

7. A health insurance program should provide all the basic medical and hospital needs. In the home there should be provision for medical care by a general practitioner and specialist, visiting nurse service and ambulance service. In the doctor's office the patient should be allowed eye examinations, psychiatric advice, medical attention by general physicians and specialists, vaccinations, diagnostic and laboratory tests, periodic check-ups, physiotherapy, etc. In the hospital a sick person should be able to obtain medical care, bed and board, routine nursing service, drugs, medicines, laboratory examinations, surgical care and the use of operating room facilities.

⁷ "National Health Program," *America*, June 1, 1946, 75 (9): 168-69.

ties, X-ray examinations, plaster casts and bandages, etc.

One of the major defects of many present health programs is that they do not include some of the more costly items noted above. It is precisely these more expensive health costs that should be included under an insurance program. For it is these costs that handicap people most seriously.

8. Special provisions should be made for people without any income who are unable to insure themselves against the risks of accident or bad health.

9. The most economical system should be devised for collecting insurance payments. Probably this can best be done simultaneously with social security pay-roll deductions for the old-age and unemployment insurance systems.

10. Physicians and hospitals should receive adequate payment by methods which encourage quality of service and economy of cost.

CONCLUSION

Readers should not expect that health insurance will solve America's health problem. It won't. On the other hand there can be no solution to America's health problem without a national extension of the health insurance principle. Directly related to

the health of this country's citizens are many other problems: the shortage of doctors and hospital facilities in many areas; the precarious financial position of many medical schools and private hospitals; the great need for new and better research facilities; racial discrimination in hospitals and clinics; and a dozen other problems. Health insurance is a partial but extremely important answer.

Many more things are needed: doctors with vision who are willing to take a lowered income for the opportunity to do Christ-like service. Self-sacrificing hospital administrators who are willing to cooperate with community programs designed to serve the common good. A more responsible citizenry who will take ordinary precautions to protect their health.

America's health is everybody's problem: the doctor's, the hospital's, the government's, the labor union's and the citizen's. When all these groups understand what the facts about the nation's health are, when they recognize the way in which our society has disregarded the dignity of men in the field of health, the people of the United States will introduce a health program to give every man and woman an opportunity to live in a manner worthy of his dignity as a child of God.

The Problem of Islam in Africa

A. E. HOWELL, W.F.

*Reprinted from THE PYLON**

SPEAKING in general the North of Africa is still a solid Moslem block; some regions of the West have a majority of Moslems; so has the Sudan. Moslems are penetrating, but are in a minority, along the coast and in some regions around the Great Lakes. In Africa, Moslems total about 40,000,000 souls; non-Catholic Christians number 8,000,000; there are 10,000,000 Catholics and 70,000,000 pagans.

The Moslem problem is vast and complex. Islam has great seductive force, a great power of resistance to Christian influence, and it is spreading.

Why is it so attractive?

It has something higher to offer than ancient paganism. It satisfies to some extent the intelligence, the need for a faith of some kind, and on the other hand it leaves one more or less free to satisfy one's passions. There are no mysteries; no embarrassing dogmas; and there is social solidarity and a call to generosity towards the followers of the Prophet. It satisfies ambition with its dream of universal domination, and it satisfies the male with the complete dominion it gives him over woman, whom it keeps in subjection in the dark.

If conscience should be uneasy under the license of the passions, it is calmed by fasting, prayer, fatalism and easy salvation by faith, with the prospect of a heaven of still greater sensual delights. It is cut to the measure of the easy-going East and so suits Africa, too; and it cultivates pride to a fanatical degree, at least religious pride, which makes any thought of a conversion to Christianity unthinkable, as a ghastly degradation.

The whole is based on the Sacred Book: the *Koran*. It is, for the Moslem, divine, and he uses no other; it is his philosophy, his history, his law and his literature. Its divine origin is taken for granted or its own excellence serves as proof of its divinity. The *Koran* itself guarantees Mohammed's mission, for was it not dictated to the prophet by the Angel Gabriel?

To Western minds it appears astonishing that it has influenced so many millions for so long. The answer seems to be that it has never

* 10 Via Boncompagni, Rome, Italy, July, 1947

been subjected to a rational examination by Moslems; to doubt it would be sacrilege. Now, in that fact surely lies the answer to the question: "What is the future of Islam?"

It has been glibly said that the Moslem is unconvertible. That is not true. In the first place it is a Catholic dogma that God wills all men to be saved; and He wills all men to be saved through the Catholic Church. That is one fact. There is another. Until recently no serious attempt has ever been made to convert the Moslems, and even now relatively very little is being done.

Islam is a closed tin. It has kept its adherents as much as possible away from disturbing influences. In North Africa the mass of the people cannot read or write, practically no women at all can read. But the situation is rapidly changing. The modern social, economic and political evolution is making holes in the closed tin. Fresh air is infiltrating. We have seen that Moslems attend Catholic colleges in Egypt; in Tunis and Algiers, Arabs go to the French colleges; women are beginning to wake up and to rebel against their ghastly state of ignorance, inferiority and servile subjection.

We do not agree with those who say that Islam is our greatest obstacle in Africa. When fresh air penetrates into a tin of corned beef, the beef becomes uneatable. Fresh air will render Islam uneatable by its own adherents. Education will kill Islam.



Today's Challenge

"In our own day, we face great changes. Something like the beginning of a new era, with the disappearance of an old one, is taking place about us. Problems and problems challenge us. Our great work is to find a solution of these problems without the surrender of our democratic inheritance, one which will widen the reaches of our free institutions and enrich the political inheritance of future generations."—*His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch at the Altgeld Centenary Banquet, Chicago, Jan. 9, 1948.*

Translations of the Bible

EDWARD V. STACKPOOLE, S.J.

*Reprinted from The OREGON-JESUIT**

ARTICLES on the Bible have a tendency to become rather dry and stuffy. No one short of a theologian can wade through the maze of codex references and copious footnotes with any facility. But there is no need for this to be true, especially if the discussion centers particularly about the various English translations of the New Testament.

God didn't intend the Bible to be obscure. Although it was originally written in the ancient Hebrew and underwent translations into Greek and Latin, those were the common languages of the day. When the Jews living outside of Palestine began to speak Greek, they translated the Old Testament into Greek. The New Testament was written mainly in Greek for the same reason: everyone spoke it. Greek was succeeded by Latin as the everyday language, and so the Latin versions came into being. When Latin died out and the languages of the different countries developed, the Bible followed the trend of the times.

Behind all these translations, it is easy to see the mind of the Church. The Bible is for the people, and therefore must be published in a language that the people can read. It is not for

a few isolated scholars who are fluent in Latin and Greek and Hebrew—all of them dead languages. At the time of the reformation the Protestants accused the Church of keeping the Bible away from the people, in spite of the fact that before that time there had been many Catholic translations into the vernacular.

As English developed, the English translations of the Bible had to keep pace with the language. Anglican editions were published when the English broke their allegiance to Rome, editions that would conform to their heretical teachings. They simply left out passages they couldn't agree with. The faithful Catholics had their new translations too, based on the version that was approved by the Catholic church, the "Vulgate," St. Jerome's translation from the Greek and Hebrew into Latin.

The first and most important post-reformation Catholic translation into English is the Rheims-Douai version. It is so called because the exiled English Catholics had to publish it in those two French cities. This translation is still used today, modified, of course, to agree with modifications in the English language.

The most successful of these modi-

* 516 Empire State Bldg., Spokane 2, Wash., January, 1948

fications was that of Archbishop Challoner in 1750. Up until a short time ago it was still quite popular—for the most part, because the more modern revisions of his revision weren't too good. Though everyone used his text, the need of a new revision was recognized.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the great Cardinal Newman was asked to write a completely new translation of the Bible. Unfortunately this task met with too much opposition and the gentle Cardinal was obliged to give it up.

A NEW EDITION

Not very long ago the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine requested a new translation, and succeeded in having this request fulfilled. This new edition appeared in 1941, and, as Challoner's, is another revision of Douai. It has retained much of the Douai version, its advantage lying chiefly in the clarifications that scientific research had brought about in the Vulgate. Based on this official text, it may be used in churches for liturgical functions. It is the version from which most priests read the Sunday gospel.

Another recent translation is Msgr. Ronald Knox's *New Testament*. This might be called the English counterpart of the Confraternity translation, since it has been authorized by the English bishops, as the other has been authorized by the American bishops.

These two translations differ somewhat—in the manner of translating not in the subject matter itself. Monsignor Knox has not used the Douai version, but has translated directly from the Latin Vulgate.

There are two other recent translations that merit attention, but these fall under a different category. Instead of being translations from the Vulgate, they are taken from the original Greek.

Now this brings up a point that bears explanation. The original Greek is closer to the exact wording of the apostles than is the Vulgate, but at the Council of Trent the Church saw the need of one official version. She chose the Vulgate because it had been in use by the Church for centuries, and consequently contains the Word of God unfalsified. At the same time, this does not condemn the older Greek and Hebrew documents.

The two versions mentioned above are the Westminster version, published in England in 1929, and Fr. Spencer's version, published in 1937 in America. There is a real need for this type of translation, for textual criticism is always advancing, bringing to light more facts about Sacred Scripture. We should all be interested to some extent in this science that deals with the written word of God.

An example is always the best way to bring out a point. The twentieth chapter of the gospel of St. John tells of the meeting of our Lord with Mary

Magdalen, just after his resurrection. The Greek version of this passage gives "Me mou haptou," which means, "Don't cling, or, hold on, to me." Now this passage when translated into the Vulgate was rendered, "Noli me tangere," which says about the same thing, but shifts the emphasis from "cling" to the idea of "touch."

Now a lot of speculation has arisen over the meaning of this passage. If you take it in the Latin, you have, "Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to my Father. But go to my brethren and say to them, etc., etc." Which means?

None of the ancient commentators on the Gospels could quite make out what this meant. The closest they could come was a mystic interpretation; Mary should not touch our Lord for, on account of His risen state, she was unworthy to do such a thing. If you accept this interpretation, how do you explain the fact that a few minutes later He let the other holy women touch him without the slightest rebuke.

Take the meaning of the Greek words and you have an intelligent statement. "Mary, you don't have to hold on to me; I have risen, but I shall stay on earth for a while before I ascend to my Father in heaven. Hurry and tell the good news to my disciples." He doesn't want the fervent woman to delay too long adoring her risen Lord. Now is the time for action. The beloved disciples have

a right to share in the joy of Easter.

The Douai version, which is a literal translation of the Latin Vulgate, uses "touch." So did Archbishop Challoner and so did the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, since they are both based on the Douai version. Monsignor Knox did not use the Douai version as a model; he translated directly from the Vulgate. The Monsignor, being familiar also with the Greek, saw the divergence of "haptou" and "tangere"; he has used "Do not cling to me," which is what the Vulgate really tries to say.

The Westminster and Father Spencer's versions both use "hold." Here of course there is no connection with the Latin "tangere" but a direct translation from the Greek.

It is difficult to establish a definite norm regarding the relative merits of these versions. Many are accustomed to the phrases and vocabulary of Douai, and for these the Douai or Confraternity editions will probably be more acceptable. Many are pleased by the freshness and vitality of Monsignor Knox's translation. He was freer in his task and did not try to follow a previous English model. The result is more a work of art.

There is a significance in these new translations. They point to the fact that there is among the English speaking peoples of today an awakening "Bible-consciousness." God wrote the Bible for us; we should know it intimately.

To Drink or Not to Drink

THOMAS F. DOYLE

*Reprinted from The MARIANIST**

HERE was a time when almost all the confirmed whiskey, rum and gin drinkers in this country were men. Today more than half America's women and countless thousands of teen-age boys and girls are hard liquor users. The post-Prohibition phenomenon of drinking women and youth has become so commonplace that it no longer scandalizes the popular mind. But religious leaders and thoughtful citizens generally are far from indifferent over what is now the nation's No. 1 vice—intemperance.

"It is frightening," declared the 1947 convention of the National Catholic Women's Union, "to see women, boys and girls falling victims to this dreadful menace." Conservative authorities estimate that up to 55,000,000 persons over eighteen in this country drink. More than 750,000 of these persons are chronic alcoholics, while 2,500,000 are excessive drinkers whose physical or mental health has been impaired by alcohol. Reports that heavy drinking is becoming even more widespread can only mean that too many people lack a clear understanding of the risks to mind, body and soul entailed in the intemperate use of alcohol.

The Catholic Church does not say

that drinking is sinful. No moral question is involved when a man or woman calls for a cocktail or a whisky and soda. But the Church does condemn the abuse of alcohol, which leads to other sins and often results in suffering and hardship to others. Condemnation becomes doubly rigorous when intemperate users are young people, whose immaturity exposes them to greater danger.

This article is intended especially for Catholic young people. It recommends that if the Catholic boy or girl is unwilling to foreswear liquor for life, he or she at least should not touch alcohol in any form before twenty-one. By that time, it is to be hoped that those who have not decided to become total abstainers will have developed enough spiritual strength to withstand the temptation to immoderation.

This view is supported by Dr. James H. Wall, of the National Committee on Alcohol Hygiene, who declared that, "practically speaking, young people should be discouraged from drinking before the age of twenty-one, and moderation should be held up as an ideal in this as in other forms of self-indulgence."

It would be fatuous to deny that

* 108 Franklin St., Dayton 2, Ohio. December, 1947.

Catholics supply their full share of alcoholics. They are certainly a sizable fraction of Alcoholics Anonymous, the non-sectarian, self-helping organization of reformed drunkards. They are proportionately represented among the legion of high-school boys and girls who believe there is no fun where there is no drink and that anyone who refuses a glass of beer or a highball at a party is either a prude or a "wet blanket."

CATHOLIC ADOLESCENTS

Like other adolescents, the Catholic boy who drinks does so frequently just to keep up with the gang, or to show off, while the Catholic girl may drink to be popular, or to appear sophisticated or "broadminded." The irony is that very frequently the boy comes to despise the girl who all too readily joins him in his drinking, and the girl soon learns how shallow and spineless is the companion who drowns his inhibitions in alcohol in order to become the life of the party.

That most boys who begin to drink do so for social reasons rather than because they like strong liquor is borne out by a study of the modern adolescent made by Urban H. Fleege, a former Catholic high-school principal. Another of his findings was that three out of every ten boys who use liquor get into "difficulties" because of the habit. This author writes:

We did not inquire into the nature of these difficulties, but from the volunteered

remarks, it is apparent they are the well-known difficulties that are usually produced by Venus and Bacchus working in combination. This is natural, for alcohol paves the way to eroticism, not only by stimulating sexual impulses directly, but by removing the inhibitions and conventions that usually safeguard chastity.

Mature people use alcohol as an escape from care. Youth may turn to it as a relief from boredom, or out of curiosity to try out adult experiences. The tragedy—one that can be predicted with almost mathematical certainty—is that out of every hundred adults or youths who become regular drinkers, five or six are doomed to the character wreckage and physical torture so vividly portrayed in *The Lost Weekend*. The film version of this novel has probably shown more people what may happen to them if they keep on drinking than all the books and pamphlets on alcoholism written in the last ten years.

Millions drink because they know no better. The ignorance of many people regarding the moral and the social ills caused by even sporadic drinking is astounding. It is clear from the tragedies of ruined girls, marital infidelities and crimes committed by adolescents that drinking exacts a heavy moral toll. Court records that twenty to thirty per cent of divorces are caused by alcohol, excessive use making a man physically, and often economically, unfit for married life. The blight that drink causes to the home cannot be exaggerated. The

chronic alcoholic cares more for liquor than his family. He is quarrelsome and nagging. He blames his wife for unfaithfulness without cause, and often threatens the lives of those he loves. Many doctors have seen wives collapse trying to endure the burden of an alcoholic husband.

It is said that boys and girls who frequent beer gardens or saloons or engage in petting parties, with occasional drinks to stimulate the flames of passion, are not essentially bad, but are the victims of blind or negligent parents. But the adolescent who attends a Catholic high school or college knows he cannot toss on to the shoulders of even the most culpable parent the sins he may indulge in while intoxicated. The smutty stories, sexual licenses and indecencies promoted by liquor are sins for which drinking boys and girls must themselves make answer.

It must, of course, be admitted that youth has many temptations to drink. Temperance leaders blame much of the urge to drink among women and adolescents of both sexes on the high-pressure \$100,000,000 annual sales promotion campaign of the brewers and distillers. The liquor interests are well aware of the power of colored magazine pictures of enticing-looking drinks, of romantic billboard scenes showing a couple embracing a bottle and each other, and of radio programs that make certain drinks sound irresistible. Even more potent are the

shrewder, subtler forms of advertising which inject attractive drinking scenes into a popular movie, and make the heroine a cocktail drinker. Insidious, too, are the modern short stories and novels shot through with appeals to drink.

In justice to youth, it must also be admitted that most grade- and high-school students have been receiving little or no education concerning alcohol. The fact that in many homes adolescent sons and daughters are often invited to sip with the family guests certainly cannot be overlooked. What, for example, is one to say when a 17-year-old girl rhapsodizes over the bar her daddy—a good church-going man—is putting in the basement of their home? Or when a son admits he has grown used to seeing Mama come home glassy-eyed after an afternoon of bridge and cocktails?

It is hard, indeed, to reconcile the example shown by some parents with the advice given by Dr. Edward B. Allen, instructor in psychiatry at Cornell University medical school:

Education for temperance should start in the home. It is not so much a question of advising children to drink or to refrain as it is a question of showing them the parental example of moderation in all things.

Most Americans who drink are classed as moderate in their indulgence. But America's drink bill—in terms of money spent, wages lost, health impaired, lives shortened and public expense incurred in dealing

with alcoholics—is far from moderate.

In 1946, Americans spent the appalling sum of \$8,700,000,000 on alcoholic beverages. This money could provide over a million well-constructed homes. Besides the outlay on alcohol, there is the economic loss—running into another billion dollars a year—caused by too much drinking. It is estimated that wage losses due to excessive drinking by workers are about \$500,000,000, while the financial toll of crimes and accidents chargeable to alcohol reaches close to \$300,000,000. Other burdens, which the taxpayers must bear, are the large sums required to provide hospital and medical care for alcoholics, or to support drunken persons in local jails.

Medical men have called alcoholism America's greatest unsolved public-health problem. According to insurance statistics, the intemperate use of alcohol shortens life expectancy ten to thirteen years. If you are a total abstainer, your chances of living to a ripe old age are fifty per cent greater than the drinker's. Your risk of being killed by an automobile while crossing the street is twenty-five per cent less.

Prolonged substitution of alcohol for food produces a variety of diseases. Among them is Wernicke's disease, which is characterized by a diminution of consciousness, and which, before the discovery of vitamin therapy, was invariably fatal. Fatty degeneration of the liver is found in

seventy-five per cent of all chronic alcoholics, and as autopsy records show, these people are nearly nine times more likely to develop cirrhosis of the liver than the abstainer. Lung abscesses are frequently produced by aspiration during a drunken stupor. Alcohol makes the human body more susceptible to infection, especially to pneumonia. According to hospital records, pneumonia is five to six times more prevalent among chronic alcoholics than among non-drinkers.

MORTALITY RATE

Meanwhile, the mortality rate of children from alcoholic families is nearly twice as high as among children of temperate families. This is because the economic, social and hygienic deterioration of the alcoholic family contributes to the spread of diseases, especially tuberculosis. The children who do survive are deprived of a good environment to keep them in their physical and mental growth.

Alcoholism has long been recognized also as one of America's major mental problems. About sixty per cent of all chronic alcoholics end their lives in psychiatric wards, if they do not drink themselves to death. Alcoholics admitted to mental institutions have jumped from 3,760 in 1922, the year of peak Prohibition enforcement, to the present average of 12,000 annually. Alcoholism is responsible for a high percentage of the crimes committed in this country, and for most

traffic accidents. According to the National Safety Council, alcohol makes a driver fifty-five more times likely to be involved in a personal injury accident.

Once they have a clear picture of the social stigmas, the economic wastes, the incalculable physical liabilities, the suffering and misery caused to innocent persons, involved in the drink habit, adolescent Catholics should find it easier to stay away from liquor at least until maturity. In many dioceses, bishops administer a total abstinence pledge — binding until twenty-one — at confirmation, and there are hopes that other dioceses will follow their example.

It was announced at the 1947 convention of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America that attempts are being made in twenty-four states to foster "the practice of temperance in the sublime degree of total abstinence." This society, which is headed by Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia, is not a blue-law organization of busy-bodies seeking to regulate by air-tight laws the conduct of their fellows. It is, instead, a group of sensible, sincere Catholics, who believe that alcoholic beverages add nothing essential to the joy of living, and who hope to persuade more and more Catholics, especially boys and girls, that the practice of sobriety can be a great blessing and a way to a fuller and happier life.

Sooner or later, the Catholic youth

must face the social pressures and patterns which have helped to make drinking so universal. What is he to do when tempted? If he takes his first drink — well, he has done no wrong. But let him remember that the consensus among scientific authorities is that those who begin drinking when they are young are more likely to become alcoholics than those who wait until they are mature. Not long ago, a father complained to the Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago that his 17-year-old son was spending his time drinking in taverns instead of studying. From a mother came the complaint that her adolescent daughter was going with other girls to a saloon where they were being "picked up" by older men. Admittedly, these are exceptional cases, but they occur often enough to prove that many youthful intemperates soon find that drinking holds an insidious lure. This is particularly true when poor home or other environmental conditions tempt boys or girls to seek release from their frustrations.

In the moment of temptation the Catholic boy or girl might well ponder the question that Aloysius Gonzaga, the young Italian Jesuit who was canonized in 1726, was forever asking himself: "How does this action square with my eternal destiny?" Or he or she might well consider this fact: the best scientists cannot distinguish between those who will and those who will not become alcoholics.

Or this dire truth: alcohol is responsible for untold sins of lust and brutality committed by normally well-balanced people who found out too late that while one man may stop after a drink or two, another will crave a barrel after his first glass.

TOTAL ABSTINENCE

Is total abstinence too heavy a burden? Can we expect Catholic adolescents and adults to keep away from drink despite what one writer has called "the powerful compulsions of conviviality," or the type of propaganda which depicts drinking as just a pleasant and harmless form of indulgence? This was more or less the question that Father Theobald Mathew, the famous Irish apostle of temperance, asked himself before he began his great total abstinence crusade in 1838.

It is recorded that Father Mathew spent a month making up his mind. Finally, at a meeting in a Cork schoolroom, he declared:

No person in health has any need of intoxicating drinks. . . . Many of you have proved they can be done without. . . . After much reflection on the subject, I have come to the conclusion that there is no necessity for them for anyone in good health, and I advise you all to follow my example. I will be the first to sign my name in the (pledge) book which is on the table, and I hope we shall soon have it full.

Before his death in 1856, the Capuchin priest had administered the

pledge personally to over 5,000,000 persons, 600,000 of them in the United States, where he spent two years addressing meetings in 300 cities and towns.

The three-fold lesson taught by Father Mathew was that, as a general rule, alcoholic liquor is harmful; that indulgence is not a sign of manhood, but a potential cause of sin, misery and disease; and that the only safe course is to practice the self-denial inherent in total abstinence.

One vital reason for advocating total abstinence is: the more numerous total abstainers become, the greater will be the chance of creating a new atmosphere in America in which drinking will have ceased to be a social convention. It is dramatic when one individual is saved from the degradation of alcoholism, but it would be epic if hundreds of thousands of Catholic boys and girls all over the country resolved to be total abstainers. Besides the positive personal spiritual and physical gain that comes from taking the pledge, there is the effect of such example on others. What we should hope for is a great army of young Catholics who will set a pattern of high personal integrity in an age when so many apparently have forgotten that some degree of self-mortification is essential for genuine Christian living.

No honest person—even if he be a confirmed drinker—will contend that alcoholic indulgence is seemly or

proper for young persons. Adolescents themselves invariably have a higher respect for their non-drinking contemporaries. It may be a matter of moral indifference when an 18-year-old boy takes a beer or a high-ball, but who will pretend that his occasional drinking makes him a more wholesome or manly person? Or who will pretend that the teen-age girl who seeks a little social "fling" would not be happier going to a parish social and dance with her boy friend than standing with him at a saloon bar where both are so pitifully out of place?

Many young people, of course, will decline to follow the path of total abstinence. They are not to be blamed, since neither common sense nor Catholic teaching confuses the

use of alcohol with its abuse. But however unwilling such youth may be to accept an undertaking which so many others have cheerfully done, they should at least be willing to wait until sound character habits are so deeply set as to ensure they will keep their drinking within limits prescribed by Christian honor, wisdom and self-respect.

Meanwhile, neither adult nor adolescent can afford to forget that there is never any guarantee that social drinking will not be the door to habitual drinking, nor that regular drinking will not pave the way to alcoholism. To drink safely means always to practice such moderation that innocent indulgence may never degenerate into a vice to threaten the ruin of body and soul.



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: John LaFarge

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Edward F. Clark

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.